LA
55
M959

LA96.M9

ACCESSION NUMBER 47353

SHELF NUMBER ~~C1120.12~~

The Virginia Library
McCormick
Theological Seminary
of the
Presbyterian Church, Chicago
826 Belden Avenue

From WITHDRAWN

Received Nov, 1919

THE SCHOOLS

OF

CHARLES THE GREAT

LONDON : PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
AND PARLIAMENT STREET
ANASTATISCHER DRUCK v. C. PARIS. BERLIN N. 58.

THE

SCHOOLS OF CHARLES THE GREAT

AND THE

RESTORATION OF EDUCATION

IN THE

NINTH CENTURY

BY

J. BASS MULLINGER, M.A.

ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

AUTHOR OF 'THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE ROYAL INJUNCTIONS OF 1535' ETC.

WITHDRAWN

AWARDED THE KAYE PRIZE OF £ 500.—.—

ANASTATIC REPRINT OF THE EDITION LONDON 1877.

NEW YORK

G. E. STECHERT & CO.

1911.

VIRGINIA LIBRARY
MCCORMICK
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

LA
96
M959

TO THE

REV. CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, M.A.

FELLOW OF PETERHOUSE

THIS VOLUME

IS

GRATEFULLY INSCRIBED

47353

PREFACE.

THE PERIOD and the subject to which this volume is devoted have both no ordinary claim on the attention of the student,—the former, as representing the era wherein, by the common consent of the most eminent authorities, we may find the true boundary line between ancient and modern history,—the latter, as containing the key to those traditions which have ever since prevailed in European education and can scarcely even yet be regarded as superseded or effete.

The present work is restricted to an attempt to place in a clearer light the character of the learning and the theory of education which mediaeval Europe inherited from a combination of pagan science and Christian theology, before that learning and that education were, in turn, modified by the teaching of the Schoolmen. The following pages accordingly represent but a very limited field of enquiry in the wide province of Carolingian history; but that field, though narrow, is not unimportant. That it is altogether erroneous to look upon the influences trans-

mitted by the reforms and policy of Charles the Great as of no greater permanence than the fabric of the Empire itself, is now generally conceded, and in no respect have those influences had a more enduring effect than in connexion with the history of mental culture in Europe. It is indeed not a little remarkable, that in this somewhat unduly neglected ninth century we may discern, as in miniature, all those contending principles—the conservative, the progressive, and the speculative—which, save in the darkest times, have rarely since ceased to be apparent in the great centres of our higher education.

While the author has freely availed himself of whatever aids or suggestions might be afforded by modern contributions to the literature of the subject, it has throughout been his endeavour, as far as practicable, to rely mainly on original research, and the references to his authorities have been systematically given.[1] The valuable corrections of the chronology and text of Alcuin's letters contained in Dümmler's *Alcuiniana* have been carefully noted, but it has been thought better, as a rule, to refer in the notes to the text of Migne's *Patrologia* (vols. c and ci), as more generally available.

Two volumes treating on the same subject—Dr. Karl Werner's *Alcuin und sein Jahrhundert* (1876) and M.

[1] With the view of rendering these references more concise, a List of the Principal Authorities referred to has been prefixed, in which the title of each work is given in full, together with the edition used—the references in the text being limited to the *name* and the *page*.

Vétault's *Charlemagne* (1877)—have appeared too late to enable the author to profit by any additional light that these writers may have thrown upon the period.

In conclusion, his thanks are due to the two adjudicators of the Prize—his lordship, the bishop of Truro, and professor Edwin Palmer, of Oxford—for their kind permission to append an additional chapter, which serves to illustrate more fully the connexion of the present subject with the commencement of the University of Paris and of European university history at large.

February, 1877.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

	PAGE
CHARLEMAGNE and Napoleon I.	1
The Carolingian Empire contrasted with modern France	1
PROGRESS OF CHRISTIANITY AND DECLINE OF PAGANISM PRIOR TO THE AGE OF CHARLES THE GREAT	2
Gaul under the Empire	3
Hostility of the Church to pagan learning	5
The true origin of this hostility	6
Pagan literature condemned by the authoritative utterance of the Church	8
Counter-intolerance of paganism	8
Decree of Julian against Christian teachers, A.D. 363	9
Impolitic severity of this measure	9
Testimony of Jerome to the growing neglect of pagan literature	10
Two distinct theories as to the advantages derivable from the study of that literature always discernible in the Church	10
Difficulties of the position of the Christian educator at this period	11
AUSONIUS	11
Character of the education imparted in the imperial schools	12
Opportunities afforded by his high position and by circumstances for beneficial reforms	13
Status of the public instructor	14
Scope afforded for private enterprise in instruction	14
Ausonius unequal to the occasion	15
Character of his genius	15
SIDONIUS APOLLINARIS	16
Circumstances of his age compared with those of that of Ausonius	17
Triviality of tone that pervades his writings	17
His literary sympathies opposed to the theory prevalent in the Church in his time	18
That theory had not yet succeeded in finding complete expression in practice	19
Final overthrow of the Roman or pagan traditions	20

PAGE

THE FRANKISH INVASION AND CONQUEST 20
The Frank and the Gallo-Roman compared 20
The Frankish conquest not altogether destructive . . . 22
SALVIAN 22
His despair of his countrymen 23
The *De Gubernatione Dei* 23
Change in popular feeling with respect to paganism . . 24
RISE OF THE SCHOOLS OF CASSIAN 24
The monasticism of the West 24
Antithesis it presents to the eastern theory 25
Main facts in the life of Cassian 25
His *Collationes* and *Institutiones* 26
His teaching with respect to pagan literature . . . 27
His theory in relation to the study of the Scriptures . . 27
The four Scriptural senses 28
He enjoins active and laborious duties on the monk . . 28
The monastery a school for heaven 29
Points in which the rule of Cassian harmonised with the Frankish character 29
Rapid progress of monasticism in Gaul in the fifth and sixth centuries 30
The monastic and episcopal schools supplant the municipal schools 31
Character of the education they imparted 31
Compact between the Teutonic conqueror and the Latin clergy . 32
The traditions of the schools of Cassian unfavourable to the literary spirit 32
Decline of theological learning in these schools . . . 33
GREGORY OF TOURS 34
His testimony to the decay of learning 35
His representations confirmed by the internal evidence of his writings 35
Testimony of Fortunatus 36
The Merovingian dynasty 36
State of the Church under this dynasty 37
Demoralisation of the episcopal order 38
State of the monastic discipline 38
The servile element in the monasteries 38
Charles Martel 39
Prospects of learning at the accession of Pepin-le-Bref . . 39

CHAPTER I.

CHARLES THE GREAT AND ALCUIN; OR, THE SCHOOL OF THE PALACE.

ST. COLUMBAN 41
Character of his monastic rule 41
ST. BONIFACE 41
Foundation of the abbey of Monte Cassino 42

ST. BONIFACE—*continued.*
PAGE
Introduction of the Benedictine rule 42
Its leading characteristics 42
Provision made for regular study among the monks . . . 42
Boniface in Frankland 43
Measures of Church reform 44
Foundation of the abbey at Fulda 45
Alliance between Rome and the Carolingian dynasty . . 45
Influence of Boniface with respect to education . . . 46
ACCESSION OF CHARLES 47
He meets Alcuin at Parma 47
His previous efforts in the cause of letters 47
Paulus Diaconus 48
TEACHERS AT YORK: Elbert and Eanbald 49
Position of Alcuin at York 50
He accepts the office of instructor of the Palace School . . 50
The episcopal or cathedral school at York 51
Its tradition of learning 51
THE TEACHING OF GREGORY THE GREAT 52
Theories associated with the fall of Rome 52
The pagan tradition 53
Views of Christian writers 53
The invasion of the Lombards 53
Gregory's belief that the world was near its end . . . 54
General acceptance of St. Gregory's teaching in England . 54
Its transmission through the teachers of Alcuin . . . 54
Antagonism of this teaching to the Eastern Church . . 55
Differences between British and Latin Christianity . . . 56
Controversy concerning Easter 56
Other points of difference 57
The Roman doctrine supplants that of the British Church . 57
Bede's sympathy with the former 58
Bede's mental characteristics 58
Alcuin's agreement with Bede 59
Harmony between his views and the Carolingian policy . . 59
THE LIBRARY AT YORK AND THE AUTHORS STUDIED BY ALCUIN . 61
Boethius 61
Portions of his translations of Aristotle known to Alcuin . . 62
Cassiodorus 63
Isidorus 63
Martianus Capella 64
His allegorical treatment of his subject 64
Influence attributed to his example 65
Speculative character of the treatise 65
Mistrust with which it was consequently regarded by the teachers at York 66
Their apprehensions not altogether without reason 66

THE LIBRARY AT YORK, &c.—*continued.* PAGE
The absence and presence of the treatise alike significant . . 67
Influence of the foregoing text-books on subsequent learning . 67
Favour with which Charles regarded foreigners . . . 67
Distractions of the time 68
The Saxon war 68
THE PALACE SCHOOL: question of its previous existence . . . 68
Innovation in this school on the Gregorian tradition . . 69
Character of its members 69
Practical nature of Charles' designs 70
Charles' own acquirements 70
Conditions under which Alcuin's instructions were imparted . 71
Members of the circle: Charles and his sons 71
His sister, his wife (Liutgarda), and his daughter . . . 72
Angilbert, Adelhard and Wala, Riculfus, Einhard, Fredegis . . 72
Names assumed by members of the school 72
Alcuin's admiration of Charles 73
His post a laborious one 73
Advantages under which he taught 74
Alcuin not a philosopher 74
His reputation as a grammarian 74
His instruction in GRAMMAR 75
The letter defined 75
The syllable 76
Strange blunders 76
Limitations with which the term *grammatica* was employed by Alcuin 76
Alcuin's views on orthography 78
Value of his treatise 78
Real extent of his Greek scholarship 79
Tradition of Greek learning in England . . . 80
Bede's testimony 80
Alcuin's Greek quotations mostly from Jerome . . 80
Inaccurate Greek forms 80
Illustration from Ozanam of superficial criticism in relation to the learning of the period 81
Alcuin's attempts to amuse his scholars 82
His RHETORIC: 83
His definition of rhetoric 83
Meagre treatment of the subject 84
He descants on the qualifications of the orator . . . 84
His distinction between the moral philosopher and the Christian teacher 85
His LOGIC: 85
Traditional views of the Church with respect to the dialectic art 85
Alcuin's treatment of arithmetic and astronomy . . . 88

THE PALACE SCHOOL—*continued.* PAGE

His explanation of an astronomical phenomenon . . . 88
Alcuin as a THEOLOGIAN: 89
His controversy with the Adoptionists 89
His adherence to the traditions of the Latin Church . . 89
His influence specially discernible in the promotion of a spirit of deference for authority 90
His tendency to an allegorical interpretation of Scripture . 90
Influence of his example in this direction 91
The pretensions of mediaeval and modern teachers contrasted . 91
Difficulties of Alcuin's position 92
His contradictions in questions of metaphysics 93
'Substance,' 'essence,' and 'being' 93
Divergence in theory among his successors 94
Fredegis as a Realist 95
Alcuin's chief friends: Arno, Benedict of Aniane, and Theodulfus . 96
Monasteries placed under his control 96
Suspension of the Saxon war 97
Charles' CAPITULARY of A.D. 787 97
Alcuin's hand discernible 99
Charles obtains the services of teachers of singing, grammar, and arithmetic from Rome 100
Council of Aachen, A.D. 789 100
The Roman method of chanting enjoined 100
Defective state of MSS. at this period 100
Charles causes a Homilary to be prepared for use in the churches . . 101
Capitularies respecting the clergy 101
Capitulary of A.D. 789 102
Every monastery to have its school 102
THEODULFUS: his Capitulary to the clergy of his diocese . . . 102
He initiates a system of free education 102
Criticisms of Gibbon and Lorenz on the period compared . . . 103
Circumstances that induce Alcuin to wish to retire from his post . 104
His ordeals in the Palace School 104
Frequent journeys 105
Excitement of successive wars 105
Laxity of the court life 105
Alcuin revisits England 106
Disagreement between the Mercian and the Frankish court . . 106
War averted by Alcuin's efforts 107
Subsequent events in England 107
THE CAROLINES 107
Alcuin created abbat of St. Martin of Tours 108

CHAPTER II.

ALCUIN AT TOURS; OR, THE SCHOOL OF THE MONASTERY.

PAGE

Alcuin's aims and sentiments as abbat 110
His increasing austerity in relation to classical literature . . . 110
His measures of reform 111
His letter to Charles 111
His representations to Charles somewhat at variance with his actual discipline 111
Story told of Sigulfus 111
Alcuin's general discipline 113
Numerous students from England 113
Envy of the Neustrians 113
Alcuin's preference for his own countrymen 114
Difference in this respect between him and Charles . . . 114
THE IRISH MONASTERIES IN THE SIXTH AND SEVENTH CENTURIES . 115
Columban's successes in Frankland 115
Controversy between the Celtic and Latin Churches . . 116
The light in which such controversies present themselves in history 116
Other points of divergence between the Celtic and the Latin clergy 117
Denial by the former of the authority of Rome . . . 117
Resemblance between the Celtic and the Eastern theological spirit 118
Boniface and the Irish clergy 119
Astronomical knowledge possessed by the latter . . . 119
Charles' interest in astronomical questions 120
His relations with Ireland 120
He welcomes Clement of Ireland at Aachen, and appoints him head of the Palace School 121
Alcuin's discomfiture 121
Alarm of the orthodox party 122
Alcuin's further correspondence with Charles 123
His triumph over the Adoptionists 123
He declines to accompany Charles to Rome 124
He congratulates him on his accession to the imperial dignity . . 124
His dispute with Theodulfus 125
His last illness and death 125
His character and services estimated 126

CHAPTER III.

RABANUS MAURUS; OR, THE SCHOOL AT FULDA.

Charles' final labours 128
LEWIS THE PIOUS 128
His measures of reform 129
Benedict of Aniane 129

PAGE
The Council of Aachen 129
The Benedictine rule generally enforced 129
Scholars not designed for the religious life to be separated from the *oblati* in the monastic schools 130
The Episcopal Schools 130
Character of the education there given 131
The schools at Orleans and Rheims 131
The monastic schools at Corbey, St. Riquier, St. Martin of Metz, St. Bertin, &c. 132
Decline of the school at Tours 133
Fredegis 133
Alcuin's forebodings verified 134
Fees exacted from the scholars 134
Lewis' Reforms 135
Petition of the bishops for the founding of three public schools 136
Outbreak of civil war 136
Lament of Florus 137
Rabanus Maurus 138
He is sent from Fulda to Alcuin at Tours 139
His return to Fulda 139
Is appointed teacher of the monastery school 139
Calamitous experiences of the community 139
Misrule of Ratgar 140
Sufferings and discontent of the monks 140
Their efforts to obtain redress 141
Ratgar is deposed and Eigil appointed in his place 141
The monastery school reopened 142
Rabanus' *De Institutione Clericorum* 142
The rules therein laid down derived mainly from the Fathers . 143
Greater liberality of sentiment than in Alcuin's writings . . 143
His estimate of pagan literature, rhetoric, and dialectic . . 144
His view with respect to pagan philosophy 145
His commentary on St. Matthew 145
Extravagancies of his anagogical interpretation 146
His superiority to Alcuin in his interpretation of natural phenomena 147
His theory of subjective illusions 147
He rebukes the superstition of the native peasantry . . . 148
His own superstitious veneration of relics 149
Points of contrast with Alcuin 150
Testimony of Einhard to the clearness of his instruction . . 150
Testimonies of Church writers to his merits 151
His activity as a founder 151
His Pupils: Walafrid Strabo, Otfried of Weissenberg, Rudolfus, Liutpert, &c. 152
Difficulties involved in the theory that Rabanus was the author of the gloss discovered by Cousin 153

RABANUS MAURUS—*continued* PAGE
His sympathies as a politician 155
His loyalty to Lewis the Pious and to Lothair . . . 155
He retires to Petersberg 155
His writings while in retirement 155
His relations to Lothair and Lewis the German 155
He is elected archbishop of Maintz 156
Influence of the episcopal order at this period . . . 156

CHAPTER IV.

LUPUS SERVATUS; OR, THE CLASSICS IN THE NINTH CENTURY.

Lupus and Alcuin contrasted 158
Lupus' early education 158
His removal to Fulda and education under Rabanus and Einhard 159
His return to Ferrières and promotion to the abbatship . . 159
Intercourse between monastic communities at this period . . 159
CHARLES THE BALD 160
His literary sympathies 160
Difficulties that attended his reign 160
The invasions of the Northmen 161
Lupus in the capacity of a soldier 161
Confiscation of monastic lands by the nobility 162
St. Judoc taken from Ferrières 162
Remonstrance of Lupus with Charles 163
Language of the Council of Thionville 163
Services of Lupus to the state 164
Tardiness in the work of restitution 164
His services to the Church 164
Probable date of his death 165
His devotion to letters and exalted conception of their use . . 165
His literary correspondence 166
He deplores the spirit with which learning is regarded by the majority 166
His perseverance in the search for books 166
His literary criticisms 167
Enumeration of classical authors that appear to have been known to him 168
Difficulties and dangers that attended his efforts 169
The influence of his classical studies discernible 169

CHAPTER V.

JOHN SCOTUS ERIGENA; OR, THE IRISH SCHOOL.

Observation of Thomas Gale 171
John the connecting link between preceding schools of learning and the scholastic philosophy 171

PAGE
His birth and early education 172
His reception at the court of Charles the Bald 173
Character of that monarch 173
His liberal patronage of learning 174
Influx of Irish scholars into Frankland 174
Circumstances of John Scotus' arrival contrasted with those of Alcuin's 174
His extensive attainments 174
His knowledge of Greek 175
His Celtic culture 175
Influence exercised on his mind by the *Timaeus* and the Pseudo-Dionysius 176
The latter treatise described 176
John invited by Charles the Bald to undertake its translation . . . 177
Testimony of Anastasius to his success 177
Influence of the treatise on his philosophy 178
The *Timaeus* 178
The Platonic theory not reconcileable with predestinarianism . . . 179
Hincmar invites John to reply to Gotteschalk 179
GOTTESCHALK'S PREVIOUS CAREER 179
His theory of predestination 180
It divides the Frankish theologians 181
Gotteschalk strenuously opposed by Rabanus 181
His efforts at propagating his doctrine 182
His appeal to the Synod of Maintz 182
His condemnation and disgrace 182
His sentence at the Council of Chiersy 183
Counter movement in his favour 183
John Scotus' *De Praedestinatione* 184
He employs the aid of dialectic 184
Maintains that religion and true philosophy cannot be opposed . . 185
His fourfold method of argument 185
Features in his treatise that specially evoked opposition . . . 186
PRUDENTIUS 187
His reply to John Scotus 187
Small value of these treatises in relation to the question at issue . 188
Sequel of the controversy in the ninth century 189
Value of its literature as illustrative of the progress towards scholasticism 189
Doubts respecting John's latter career 190
Quid distat inter? 190
The connexion between this era and that of the University of Paris . 191
Conclusion 192

*** *The subjoined list of works frequently referred to in the following pages is here given in order to obviate unnecessary repetition of the title of each work and the edition used.*

Alcuiniana: ed. Wattenbach and Dümmler in Jaffé, *Bibliotheca Rerum Germanicarum*, 1873.

Ampère: *Histoire Littéraire de la France avant et sous Charlemagne*, par J. J. Ampère. 3 v. 1870.

Baluze: (Etienne) *Capitularia Regum Francorum.* 2 v. 1780.

Carolina: (*Einhardi Epistolae, Einhardi Vita Caroli Magni*, etc.) in Jaffé, *Bibliotheca Rerum Germanicarum*, 1867.

Cossart: Labbé and Cossart, *Concilia*, ed. Mansi. 1759–98.

Dümmler: (Ernst) *Geschichte des Ost-Frankischen Reichs*, 1872.

Guizot: *Histoire de la Civilisation en France.* 5 v. 1829-32.

Hauréau: *Histoire de la Philosophie Scholastique.* Vol. i. 1872.

Léon Maitre: *Les Ecoles Episcopales et Monastiques de l'Occident depuis Charlemagne jusqu'à Philippe-Auguste.* 1866.

Milman: (Dean) *History of Latin Christianity.* 9 v. 1867.

Monnier: *Alcuin et Charlemagne.* 1864.

Ozanam: *La Civilisation Chrétienne chez les Francs.* 1855.

Palgrave: *History of England and Normandy.* Vol. i. 185.

Pertz: *Monumenta Germaniae Historica.* 1826-69.

Prantl: *Geschichte der Logik im Abendlande.* Vols. i–iv. 1855–70.

Rabani Mauri Opera: the edition in 6 volumes by Colvener. 1626.

THE

SCHOOLS OF CHARLES THE GREAT.

INTRODUCTION.

INTROD. Charlemagne and Napoleon I.

It is a well-known story concerning the first Napoleon, that when, on his return from the campaign which was crowned by the splendid victory of Austerlitz, the adornment of Paris, as the capital of the newly inaugurated Empire, came again under discussion, he abandoned a design that he had before conceived of erecting on the Place Vendôme a column crowned by a statue of Charlemagne, and that there rose instead a column made from cannon taken on the field of the late battle, and surmounted by a statue of himself.

The Carolingian Empire contrasted with modern France.

His change of purpose was warmly commended by a few discerning judges, who had severely criticised the earlier idea, and had failed to perceive any legitimate connexion between the great emperor of Western Christendom and an emperor the very coinage of whose realm bore on its reverse the words *République Française*. To the student of mediaeval history it soon indeed becomes apparent that differences yet more considerable than those involved in dynastic descent separate the empire of Charles the Great from that of modern France. In that imperial figure which, like some magnificent colossus, flings its shadow athwart the boundary that divides the ancient from the modern era, he sees a ruler of purely Teutonic blood, king of the Lombards, emperor of the Romans, the lord of more than half the Christian world. The kingdom which Louis XI received from Charles VIII, or even that over which Louis XIV ruled after the peace of Westphalia, resembles the domain which Charles the Great

INTROD. bequeathed to Lewis the Pious, only as the province of a vast empire. Charles himself was German, *profondément Germain*, as Ampère candidly admits. He spoke the German tongue; while the language spoken in Neustria and Aquitaine—the countries that lay within the boundaries of modern France—was an unformed *patois*, a corrupt Latin not yet sufficiently transformed to be recognised as French. Paris, the modest Lutetia whose Gallic simplicity had won the affections of Julian, was as yet but a third-rate provincial town 'which the lord of Rome and Aachen once visited in the course of a long progress amongst a string of its lowly fellows.'[1] Four centuries were yet to elapse before, under the rule of another dynasty and another race, the Neustrian land was to become a terror to Western Europe, the rude *patois* to have developed into the language not only of France but of the court and the legislature of England, the provincial town to have become transformed into a splendid capital whose genius and learning attracted admirers and disciples from all parts of Christendom. It will not be irrelevant to our main enquiry if, before entering upon any discussion of the state of education in the times of Charles the Great, we devote a few pages to a consideration of the vicissitudes of political power and the traditions of learning during the dim and troublous period that separates his reign from that of Augustulus and the suspended succession of the Western Emperors.

Progress of Christianity and decline of paganism prior to the age of Charles the Great.

The history of Western Europe, long before the rise of the Carolingian dynasty, had begun to assume that character which gives to the annals of Christendom an interest far surpassing that of all other histories, in the manner in which it exhibits, partly in conflict, partly in fusion, the Aryan and the Semitic traditions and habits of thought. With the commencement of the seventh century, it is true, the long but unequal struggle between Christianity and paganism must have seemed definitely at an end. The legislation of Theodosius had repressed the ancient worship in the East; that of Honorius had confiscated its material resources in

[1] Freeman, *Essays* (First Series), p. 176.

the West. Even so early as the time of Theodosius II the eastern ruler could venture to assume that the old faith was virtually extinct.[1] A like fate might well seem to be overtaking pagan learning. At Athens the fiat of Justinian had closed the schools of philosophy and driven its last adherents into exile. At Alexandria, where eclecticism had sought to mediate between that philosophy and Christian dogma, the Saracen, scornful alike of Christian and pagan culture, had given the literary treasures of the Serapeum to the flames and was reigning with undisputed sway. INTROD.

It was precisely when Christianity thus began to receive the unquestioning allegiance of the Latin race, that a new field of conquest opened up before it amid the Teutonic nations. The records of that conquest, although chequered with much that is melancholy and repulsive, still form undoubtedly one of the most glorious chapters in the history of the Church. As the thought and literature of subjugated Greece had led captive the conquering Roman, so the religion and culture of Christian Rome subdued the strong will and overthrew the gods of the victorious Teuton. The days of the decline of the Roman power were indeed, as has been truly said, the days of its greatest conquests; the victories gained on the Metaurus, at Pydna, and on the Halys, shine with but an evanescent lustre when compared with those won by the faith, the laws, and the institutions of Christian Rome.

Gaul under the Empire.

Of all the races subdued by the arms of pagan Rome none appear eventually to have yielded a more complete submission to her rule, or to have enjoyed a larger share of prosperous contentment beneath her sway, than the inhabitants of southern Gaul. It had been the constant endeavour of the emperor Augustus to lead them to forget their ancient freedom and to abolish or transform their national institutions. With this view he sought to obliterate all distinctions of race and all local traditions. He redistributed the privileges of states and cities, shifted the centres of government,

[1] 'Pagani qui supersunt . . . quamquam jam nullos esse credamus, etc.' *Cod. Theod.* XIV XX.

INTROD. ignored the distinctions between Celt and Iberian, and pushed back the northern boundary of Aquitania from the Garonne to the Loire. His efforts were crowned by almost complete success. The Gaul of the south, when the work of subjugation had been once decisively accomplished, desisted from the struggle for freedom, and sank, like the kindred race in Britain, into contented acquiescence with his lot. No vigorous resistance like that offered by Lutetia to the arms of Caesar, and for which she paid so dearly in her enforced obscurity among the *Vectigales*—no sudden insurrection like that of Civilis—is recorded on the part of the pleasure-loving natives of Narbonnensis and Aquitania. Throughout the tranquil and prosperous age of Hadrian and the Antonines, a halo of prosperity, refinement, and classic culture surrounds the Gallic cities. It became their pride to share in the splendour and to reflect the civilisation of Rome. The native idioms well-nigh disappeared. At Lugdunum, before the close of the second century, Latin appears to have become the vernacular speech.[1] The inhabitants of Auvergne, the foremost province in wealth and perhaps in learning, delighted, according to Sidonius Apollinaris, to believe that along with the founders of the Roman power they could trace back a common descent from Trojan ancestors.[2] The Burgundians, with equal pride, asserted their descent from Rome.[3]

But precisely in proportion as they embraced the institutions and customs of ancient Rome, the Gauls shared in the degeneracy of the empire. Even so early as the first century, the historian had described them as *dites et imbelles*;[4] and while, on the one hand, the Gaul sought to dignify his descent by claiming affinity with the Roman, the German, on the other hand, deemed his ancestry best vindicated by

[1] Ampère, i 143.

[2] 'Audebant se quondam fratres Latio dicere, et sanguine ab Iliaco populos computare.' Sidon. Apoll. *Epist.* VII 7.

[3] 'Jam inde temporibus priscis subolem se esse Romanam Burgundii sciunt.' Avitus Viennensis, *Epist.*

[4] Tacitus, *Annales*, XI 18.

disclaiming kinship to the Gaul.[1] As we follow the history of the wealthy and luxurious cities successively subdued by the Roman, the Goth, and the Frank, it is easy to perceive that their civilisation was not of a kind from whence we could expect a great restoration of science and learning. History presents us with no such phenomenon in the annals of a conquered and degenerate people. Rome's most enduring conquests were achieved, not among the races whom she subjugated, but among those who had broken down the fabric of her political empire.

It would be easy accordingly at once to overstep six centuries, by simply assuming that our enquiry is connected, not with a revival of learning in southern Gaul, but in Frankland, and has its chief interest in relation to a Teutonic rather than a Latin element. Such a summary method of treatment would, however, leave unexplained much that is interesting in itself, and directly connected with our subject, and it will consequently be desirable to take up in chronological order those important moments in preceding history which otherwise would admit of being satisfactorily explained only by lengthy and frequent digressions. We propose therefore to devote a few pages to a brief but careful consideration of some of the chief vicissitudes in the annals of learning, as its traditions changed from those of paganism to those of Christianity,—from those of Trèves, Clermont, and Bordeaux to those of Christian Rome and of Canterbury and York.

Hostility of the Church to pagan learning.

It is a fact familiar to all students of ecclesiastical history, that the efforts of the teachers of early Christendom were directed to the abolition and destruction of that very literature which modern Christendom has done its best to restore and has cultivated with such untiring assiduity. Those efforts were attended with almost complete success, and in the Western Church the teaching of the Fathers proved fatal to the reign of the philosophers. The blame attaching to what, in the eyes of modern learning, seems but narrow

[1] 'Treveri et Nervii circa affectationem Germanicæ originis ultro ambitiosi sunt, tanquam per hanc gloriam sanguinis a similitudine et inertia Gallorum separentur.' Tacitus, *Germania*, c. 28.

INTROD. and mistaken illiberality rests perhaps, in the first instance, with Tertullian,[1] but can scarcely with justice be charged solely on the teachers of the Church. The names of Clemens of Alexandria,[2] of Origen, of Augustine himself, are sufficient to prove that there were great minds within her pale to whom the acceptance of Christian truth did not seem to require the rejection of all that Athens or Rome had bequeathed for the enlightenment of mankind. But unhappily the adherents of the old belief, as the indications of its approaching downfal multiplied, were led in their anger and desperation to adopt a policy which superadded to the already existing contempt the bitter enmity of the Church. They advanced rival claims, opposed their deities to the newly proclaimed Triune God, and asserted the possession of miraculous powers. We know—and it is one of the most important features in the history of the early Church—that these claims were far from being distinctly denied by her defenders, and that they consequently served to intensify the Christian abhorrence of paganism to a tenfold degree. The accusation brought against our Lord by his enemies—that He cast out evil spirits by Beelzebub's aid—was substantially identical with that made by Tertullian, Arnobius, and Lactantius against their pagan antagonists. The ancient polytheism, in their view, was a bowing down to the very powers of darkness, and the Christian was accordingly bound to carry on unceasing warfare against its adherents. To the imaginative and fairy-like conception of the old mythologies there now succeeded a dark and gloomy belief in the omnipresence of hostile and malignant spirits. Wherever his worldly avocations led him—in the marketplace, the courts of justice, the public baths, in the very

The true origin of this hostility.

[1] 'Quaerendum autem est etiam de ludi-magistris et de caeteris professoribus litterarum, imo non dubitandum affines illos esse multimodae idololatriae.' *De Idololat.* c. 10; Migne, i 673–5. Tertullian's chief argument against the scholastic profession, as involving what was incompatible with fidelity to Christian principles, appears to have been derived from the necessity that the teacher was under of discoursing about the pagan mythology and of observing the pagan festivals as opportunities of gaining presents from his pupils.

[2] See *Stromata*, i 9; Migne (S. G.) viii 739.

streets—the Christian walked surrounded by unseen enemies intent on his spiritual destruction. Between him and paganism there lay no neutral ground; every influence not in direct alliance with the faith was regarded as alien and hostile.[1] This position, once forced upon the defenders of Christianity, proved for a long period unalterable, and involved its maintainers in a bitter and painful contest. Otherwise, had it not been for pretended miracles, like those of Apollonius of Tyana—for theurgic powers, like those claimed by the Neo-Platonists—for aggressive controversial efforts, like those of Porphyry—it is far from improbable that paganism might have been suffered to die out, in obedience, as it were, to the law of natural decay. And as St. Paul, when taking his stand on the Areopagus, recognised, in the worship that he saw around, an element whereon to found his own immortal appeal, so the Christian teacher of subsequent generations might perhaps have regarded the temples and rites of paganism more in compassion than in anger, might even have discerned in them traces of a sacred and undying aspiration of the human soul, of men seeking after God if haply they might find Him.

But this was not to be; and paganism, as it fell, wore in the eyes of its destroyers the guise of a foul and monstrous creation. The legend of St. George and the Dragon, like many others of the same character, is fairly typical of the aspect under which the struggle between Christianity and paganism was viewed by the defenders of the faith. In sentiments like these it is not difficult to discern the true explanation of the attitude assumed by the Fathers. Their abhorrence (a milder term would be inadequate) of paganism as a system generated a vague mistrust of all pagan thought —of its philosophy, its science, its history, and its poetry. The concession wrung from the stern Tertullian, in the midst of his invectives against Plato, Zeno, Aristotle, Epicurus,

[1] It is not a little remarkable that, as Christianity gained the ascendant, we find the upholders of paganism admitting the superiority of the God of the Christians, but at the same time urging that the objects of their worship might fairly claim to rank as inferior deities! See a singular passage quoted by Ampère (i 211) from the *Panegyrici Veteres*.

INTROD. Heraclitus, and Empedocles alike, that, notwithstanding, something of the spirit of truth—*nonnullus etiam afflatus veritatis*[1]—was discernible in their contempt of the vulgar creed, could not avail to redeem the philosophies of the Academy, the Lyceum, and the Stoa from one sweeping condemnation. 'Refrain,' says the authoritative utterance of the Church of this period, '*refrain from all the writings of the heathen*, for what hast thou to do with strange discourses, laws, or false prophets, which in truth turn aside from the faith those who are weak in understanding? For if thou wilt explore history, thou hast the Books of the Kings; or seekest thou for words of wisdom and eloquence, thou hast the Prophets, Job, and the Book of Proverbs, wherein thou shalt find a more perfect knowledge of all eloquence and wisdom, for they are the voice of the Lord, the only wise God. Or dost thou long for tuneful strains, thou hast the Psalms; or to explore the origin of things, thou hast the Book of Genesis; or for customs and observances, thou hast the excellent law of the Lord God. Wherefore abstain scrupulously from all strange and devilish books.'[2]

Pagan literature condemned by the authoritative utterance of the Church.

Counter-intolerance of paganism.

With this unsparing proscription impending over the whole body of pagan literature, the severity with which the emperor Julian retaliated on the Christians must be allowed to have had a certain logical justification. He argued that even if the Christian teachers really believed that the gods whom Homer, Hesiod, Thucydides, and Demosthenes worshipped were impure and malignant daemons, it was nevertheless unfair to make the works of those authors the instrument of an attack upon the ancient faith. To expound

[1] *Apologia*, c. 14.

[2] Τῶν ἐθνικῶν βιβλίων πάντων ἀπέχου. Τί γάρ σοι καὶ ἀλλοτρίοις λόγοις, ἢ νόμοις, ἢ ψευδοπροφήταις, ἃ δὴ καὶ παρατρέπει τῆς πίστεως τοὺς ἔλαφρους; τί γάρ σοι καὶ λείπει ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵνα ἐπ' ἐκεῖνα τὰ ἐθνόμυθα ὁρμήσεις; εἴτε γὰρ ἱστορικὰ θέλεις διέρχεσθαι, ἔχεις τὰς βασιλείους, εἴτε σοφιστικὰ καὶ ποιητικά, ἔχεις τοὺς πρόφητας, τὸν Ἰὼβ, τὸν παροιμιαστὴν, ἐν οἷς πάσης ποιήσεως καὶ σοφιστείας πλείονα ἀγχίνοιαν εὑρήσεις, ὅτι Κυρίου τοῦ μόνου σοφοῦ Θεοῦ φθογγαί εἰσιν· εἴτε ᾀσματικῶν ὀρέγῃ, ἔχεις τοὺς ψαλμούς· εἴτε ἀρχαιογονίας, ἔχεις τὴν γένεσιν· εἴτε νομίμων καὶ παραγγελιῶν, τὸν ἔνδοξον Κυρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ νόμον. Πάντων οὖν τῶν ἀλλοτρίων καὶ διαβολικῶν ἰσχυρῶς ἄπεσχου. *Apost. Const.* bk. I, c. 6; Cotelerius, *Patres Apost.* i 206.

Homer with a view to denouncing all that Homer held most sacred and venerable, was malevolent and base. If they were determined to reject the belief of Greece and Rome, let them quit the schools of grammar and rhetoric and limit their instruction to expounding the pages of the Evangelists in the churches of the Galileans.[1]

Decree of Julian against Christian teachers, A.D. 363.

Such were the grounds on which the philosophic emperor justified his expulsion of the Christians from the office of public instructors. His veto, it is to be observed, did not extend to the Christian *learner*. Tertullian himself had conceded that the children of the faithful must still seek the elements of knowledge where alone they were to be acquired,[2] and Julian, on the other hand, hoped that in such an atmosphere they would unlearn the narrow bigotry of their religious creed. Even his positive enactment, if we accept the view of Baur,[3] was not designed to drive the Christian from the centres of civilisation and intellectual culture, but simply to afford protection to the pagan faith, and to make the missile of its adversaries recoil on their own ranks. But even by contemporary writers it was regarded as an act of excessive severity. In the language of Gregory Nazianzen it seemed to limit to the exclusive possession of a party that which was rightly the property of the whole intellectual world;[4] and Ammianus Marcellinus, pagan though he was, denounced it as *illud inclemens, obruendum perenni silentio.*[5]

Impolitic severity of this measure.

But however Julian's defenders may seek to justify or extenuate his decree, it is certain that in the sequel it proved

[1] Εἰ δὲ τοὺς τιμιωτάτους ὑπολαμβάνουσι πεπλανῆσθαι, βαδιζόντων εἰς τὰς τῶν Γαλιλαίων ἐκκλησίας, ἐξηγησόμενοι Ματθαῖον καὶ Λουκᾶν. *Epist.* 42. Νόμῳ ἐκέλευε, Χριστιανοὺς παιδεύσεως μὴ μετέχειν. Ἵνα μὴ, φησὶν, ἀκονώμενοι τὴν γλῶτταν, ἑτοίμως πρὸς τοὺς διαλεκτικοὺς τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀπαντῶσιν. Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* III 12. Migne (S. G.), lxvii 412.

[2] 'Huic necessitas ad excusationem deputatur, quia aliter discere non potest.' *De Idolol.* c. 10; Migne, i 675.

[3] *Die Christliche Kirche*, ii 42. See also Gieseler, i 313, note 5.

[4] Ὡς ἀλλοτρίου καλοῦ φῶρας, τῶν λύγων ἡμᾶς ἀπήλασεν . . . Ἀττικίζειν μὲν ἐκώλυσε, τὸ δὲ ἀληθεύειν οὐκ ἔπαυσε. Greg. Naz. *Orat.* I *cont. Julianum*, Migne (S. G.), xxxv 536.

[5] *Rerum Gest.* lib. XX x, 7; see also XXIV iv, 20; ed. Eyssenhardt, pp. 248, 328.

INTROD.

eminently disastrous to that very culture which he had fondly hoped to protect. Within less than half a century after his death we find Jerome writing from his cell at Bethlehem, and recording in exultant tones the universal neglect that had overtaken pagan learning. In earlier years the great father had himself found solace in his vigils over the page of Cicero and Plautus. A heavenly warning admonished him of his error. One night, while thus engaged, he was overcome by sleep, and borne off in a vision to heaven; and there he heard a voice addressing him, *Ciceronianus es, non Christianus, ubi enim thesaurus tuus ibi est cor tuum.*[1] Thenceforth the utterances of pagan eloquence and fancy were for him a closed volume. He candidly admits indeed that as he turned from the page of Plato to that of the sacred prophets their language seemed harsh and rude; but no father has left more emphatically on record his conviction that the study of the pagan authors was incompatible with the Christian profession. Notwithstanding his earlier predilections, we find him therefore hailing with apparently unqualified satisfaction the oblivion that seemed to be spreading over the literature he had so greatly admired. 'How many,' he asks, 'now read Aristotle? How many know even the names of Plato's writings? Here and there, in some retired nook, old age recons them at its leisure; while our rustics and fishermen are the talk of all, and the whole world echoes with their discourse.'[2]

Testimony of Jerome to the growing neglect of pagan literature.

Two distinct theories as to the advantages derivable from the study of pagan literature always discernible in the Church.

It would be a task of considerable research to point out at length how, as this tradition of the Latin Fathers gathered strength, the classical spirit declined. From the days when Tertullian first denounced the ancient literature, down to the days of Bossuet and Fénélon, two contending theories are distinctly present in the Christian Church—the theory of those who advocated the doctrine of the African father, and the theory of those who contended that the

[1] *Epist. ad Eustochium*, Migne, xxii 416.

[2] 'Quotusquisque nunc Aristotelem legit? Quanti Platonis vel libros novêre, vel nomen? Vix in angulis otiosi senes eos recolunt. Rusticanos vero et piscatores nostros totus orbis loquitur, universus mundus sonat.' *Præf. ad Comment. in Epist. ad Galatas*, lib. III, c. 5; Migne, xxvi 401.

knowledne and study of the masterpieces of antiquity might fitly and advantageously, under certain limitations, find a place in the education of Christian youth. At the time, however, that Jerome wrote, those who upheld the former view laboured under one signal disadvantage—that in the West no distinct scheme of Christian education had as yet been put forth as a substitute for the scheme of paganism. Unless therefore all system and method were to be discarded, the Christian schoolmaster could only follow in the track marked out by the imperial schools, and thus, as we shall shortly see, was still compelled to have recourse to pagan authors. The man might be censured for devoting his mature powers to the study of profane literature; but the boy and the youth must perforce still derive their training from the page of Horace and Vergil, of Terence and Pliny, of Quintilian and Donatus. It is easy also to understand that in times when, notwithstanding the activity of thought and speculation, all technical knowledge was experiencing a general decline, the teachers in those schools to which southern Gaul was indebted for so much of her renown felt little inclined to depart from their inherited traditions. Autun, already famed for her schools in the days of Tacitus, and rejoicing in the proud appellation of 'the Celtic Rome'—Trèves, which had imparted to St. Ambrose his Gallic style, and within whose precincts Lactantius had composed treatises which recalled the classic eloquence of Cicero—Clermont, where the principles of Roman jurisprudence were taught and elucidated—Besançon, Lyons, Vienne, Narbonne, Toulouse and Bordeaux, schools of scarcely inferior note—all alike exhibited that tenacious adherence to tradition which is nowhere more conspicuous than in the history of the great centres of learning.

Difficulties of the position of the Christian educator at this period.

During the period that the Church found itself confronted by this dilemma, the name most prominently associated with education is undoubtedly that of Ausonius, whose long life extended nearly from the commencement to the close of the fourth century. The education generally imparted in his day might well have exercised the capacity of a great reformer. It had become almost all that education ought

Ausonius, *b.* 310; *d.* 390.

INTROD.

Character of the education imparted in the imperial schools.

not to be—mechanical, lifeless, artificial, and wanting in everything that could stimulate the reasoning and reflective powers. In the arts' course, grammar and rhetoric were the only subjects that received much attention; the former, however, as defined by Suetonius, had long been employed to denote much more than a technical knowledge of the laws of speech, and included an extended and critical acquaintance with the principal Latin authors.[1] Even in Ausonius' own time there were 'grammarians' who were also philologists and students of comparative jurisprudence. But, for the most part, the study, as pursued in his day, was closely associated with rhetoric, and in common with that art had acquired a singularly effete and meretricious character. Ever since the time when Vespasian founded the imperial schools the training there imparted had remained unaltered, though the less genuine elements more and more preponderated over the more useful and solid. It was the training of which the letters of the younger Pliny[2] reflect the influence and also supply an interesting record, and which is more broadly discernible in the writings of Tertullian, Arnobius, and Apuleius—the training of the dialectician and rhetorician, wherein all mental culture was made subservient to the supposed requirements of the forensic orator. Its most prominent feature was the committing to memory long passages from the poets and orators, a practice which, however beneficial in moderation, was carried to an injurious excess. The memory acquired abnormal strength, but its developement was out of all just proportion to the finer mental powers, and tended to an almost entire extinction of originality of thought. Even in their own compositions the scholars generally fell back for ideas on Cicero, Horace, or Vergil, and their theses became one continuous process of ingenious but mechanical reproduction. Sometimes—a far more rational exercise—they rendered a passage from the poets into their own prose; sometimes themselves attempted the art of metrical composition. But, in either case, it was

[1] See author's *History of the University of Cambridge*, p. 7, n. 2.

[2] See especially *Epist.* I 13; V 3; VII 17; VIII 12 and 26.

a mere trickery of words, wherein the thought was entirely subordinated to the expression, while the fantastic diction and far-fetched imagery combined to form a style which could only be paralleled by the compositions of *Les Précieuses* or those of our English Euphuists. Greek, though it would appear to have been familiar to the scholars of the extreme south, of Arles and Marseilles, was almost unknown in the more northern cities. Ausonius himself appears to have learned nothing more than the rudiments as a boy.

In short, of the system of public instruction that prevailed from the first to the fifth century, it may with justice be said, that by the prominence which it assigned to the mere *ornamenta* of pagan culture, to the rejection of the more intellectual and useful elements, it afforded the best justification of the veto which the Church had already pronounced with respect to the whole body of pagan literature.

Opportunities afforded by his high position and by circumstances for beneficial reforms.

Such were the tendencies of learning in the age wherein Ausonius was called upon to act, and rarely does the history of letters present to our notice a more disappointing career. His experience was considerable; his opportunities were great. He had been educated at Toulouse, and had himself taught grammar for five years in his native city of Bordeaux. He had subsequently been appointed a public instructor in rhetoric; and after a lengthened tenure of this post had been made the tutor of the youthful Gratian at Trèves. By his imperial pupil he was, it is no exaggeration to say, trusted and honoured as no tutor had ever been before. He succeeded to the quaestorship; he was twice appointed prefect. The first time, as prefect of Italy, he had jurisdiction over not only the great cities of the peninsula, but also those of Africa—over Carthage, then in the zenith of her literary fame. The second time, as prefect of the Gauls, he ruled not only the cities of his native land, but also those of Spain and of Britain. The dignity of the consulship crowned the imposing array of his distinctions. If we add to this widely extended political influence the respect commanded by his excellent moral qualities, it is difficult to suppose that there was any reasonable amount of reform which he could not have effected

INTROD.

Status of the public instructor.

in the educational institutions of his time. Circumstances again were highly favourable to such reform. At no period do we find the function of the public teacher more respectfully regarded by the public at large. That robust good sense which, in spite of many defects, distinguished the legislation of Valentinian, had reinvigorated the whole system of instruction throughout the empire. The instructors appointed by the state received adequate and even liberal salaries; they were exempted from most of the civic and municipal burdens;[1] they were honoured by titles and dignities. Their labours were also largely supplemented by the enterprise of private teachers. An edict of the year 364 had made the office of the teacher practically free.[2] A decree of Gratian, promulgated twelve years later, had required that public instructors should be appointed in all the chief cities of Gaul, and had fixed the amount of their salaries,[3] but there is satisfactory evidence that a large body of teachers, not recognised by official authority, still pursued their calling and found scope for their activity. Ausonius himself had taught grammar for five years in a private capacity, before, in his thirtieth year, he received a public appointment in his native city.[4]

Scope afforded for private enterprise in instruction.

The conditions therefore under which the work of education was carried on in his time closely approximated to those

[1] 'Sin absque honore connectivae cujuslibet scholae regimen fuerint nacti, absolutos militia inter eos, qui duces fuerint provinciarum, numerari jubemus.' *Cod. Theod.* lib. VI, tit. 13 (ed. Haenel), p. 545; see also p. 1321.

[2] 'Vita pariter et facundia idoneus vel novum instituat auditorium vel repetat intermissum.' *Ibid.* p. 1322, dat. III Id. Janu. 364.

[3] 'Per omnem dioecesim commissam Magnificentiae tuae, frequentissimis in civitatibus quae pollent et eminent claritudine praeceptorum optimi quique erudiendae praesideant juventuti, rhetores loquimur et grammaticos atticae romanaeque doctrinae.' *Impp. Valens, Gratianus et Valentinianus Antonio Pf. P. Galliarum*, Ibid. p. 1325.

[4] 'Nos ad Grammaticen studium convertimus et mox
Rhetorices etiam quod satis attigimus.
Nec fora non celebrata mihi; *sed cura docendi*
Cultior: et nomen Grammatici merui.
. . . . . .
Exactisque dehinc per trina decennia fastis
Asserui doctor municipalem operam.'

Quoted by Kaufmann, von Raumer, *Hist. Taschenbuch* (1869), p. 91.

which modern experience seems to have finally accepted as representing a just mean between purely legislative and purely spontaneous action. The state, by fixing and securing a certain standard, protected the public from mere charlatans and adventurers; while the opportunities afforded, on the other hand, for private enterprise acted as a check upon a too perfunctory discharge of the official duties. The most zealous reformer could scarcely have asked for more favourable conditions; and had Ausonius, in that plenitude of power and confidence which he enjoyed, been endowed with the capacity to discern the critical character of his time, he might not improbably have arrested the growing illiberality of the Church and have rendered signal and lasting service to the cause of learning.

Ausonius unequal to the occasion.

Unfortunately, he was wholly unequal to the occasion. He either failed to realise the opportunity, or he preferred not to grapple with the difficulty. Ampère has very happily compared him and his brother rhetoricians to a set of Chinese mandarins, expending their energies on a series of literary futilities, and perfectly content so to do, while comfortably conscious that, whatever the abstract value of their productions, they were thus advancing themselves on the path that led to emolument and high office. Ausonius indeed owes his reputation with posterity mainly to his *Mosella*, a really admirable description of the scenery of the beautiful river. Whether, as some critics hold, the predominance of poetry of this character is always to be regarded as a sign of a degenerating literary taste is a question into which we cannot here enter, but it is undeniable that the admirers of graceful Latin verse and the admirers of descriptive poetry alike still turn with pleasure to this fine poem. Admirably true to nature, the accuracy of its details may still be recognised by the wanderer along the river's course. Cuvier, it is said, found it of real service in enabling him to identify the different species of fish that formerly existed in those waters. Otherwise there is little that Ausonius has bequeathed to posterity which, regarded simply as poetry, might not very well be spared. Feats of perverted ingenuity

Character of his genius.

INTROD. like his *Inconnexa*, or pedantic stanzas like his *Parentalia*, are valuable only as curiosities of literature or for the historical facts they incidentally supply. Yet in trifles like these a virtuous and able man, of Christian faith [1] and classic culture, frittered away his leisure, his powers, and his opportunities. We see him, as his own muse depicts him, dreamily watching the fisher lad who plies his craft on the banks of the river, inhaling the perfume of the surrounding rose gardens, and composing verses in which the concluding syllable of one line is echoed by the commencing syllable of the next. Eminently a trifler and unprescient of the future; while at his feet the murmuring Moselle steals on, by woods and vineyards and castled heights, to join the rapid Rhine, beyond which Nemesis is already forging the bolt of vengeance and retribution.

Sidonius Apollinaris, *b.* 430; *d.* 489.

It is not improbable that Ausonius, who had seen the Franks retreating before Gratian, may have died still cherishing the fond illusion that the empire would always be able to hold its own against the barbarians; but in the following century, the age of Sidonius Apollinaris, no such belief could any longer exist. 'The last of the gentleman bishops of the Roman age,' as he has been styled, Sidonius witnessed in strange conjunction the old learning, the new faith, and the pagan invader triumphing in Gaul. During the interval between his age and that of Ausonius the divergence between the Roman and the Christian tradition of learning becomes yet more strongly marked. Claudian, the last representative of the purely classical genius, who died at the commencement of the century, still preserved much of the antique spirit, but only by a process of self-isolation. 'His muse,' to quote the language of Ozanam, 'chanted her graceful strains out of hearing of the Ambrosian chant at

[1] The facts advanced by Beugnot (*Hist. de la Destruction du Paganisme*, ii 76) to shew that Ausonius was of pagan belief have been disproved by Ampère (i 247–50); see also an article by G. Kaufmann, *Rhetorenschulen und Klosterschulen; oder heidnische und christliche Cultur in Gallien während des 5. und 6. Jahrhunderts*, in von Raumer's *Historisches Taschenbuch*, 1869, pp. 10, 11. 'Man hatte,' says Böcking in his edition of the *Mosella*, p. 43, 'statt der Frage, *ob* Ausonius Christ gewesen sei, eher die aufstellen sollen: *was für ein* Christ Ausonius gewesen sei?'

Milan.' Sidonius, in turn, offers the last eminent example, for a long period, of an attempted combination of classic and Christian culture.[1]

Sidonius was a native of Lyons, where he was born about the year 430, of noble parents, the representatives of a family from which the illustrious house of the Polignacs claim to trace their pedigree. He was son-in-law of the emperor Avitus, to whom he addresses some of his most elaborate panegyrics—compositions which afford excellent illustration of the literary taste of the period. His connexions and high position, together with a certain similarity in his writings, at once suggest a comparison with Ausonius, but the difference in the circumstances of their times is all-important. The age in which Sidonius lived was one in which the most sanguine and the most discerning observer might alike well have despaired of the future of civilisation. In his earlier years, it is true, some rays of hope might still have seemed to linger over the prospect. The first efforts of his muse were called forth to commemorate the brief successes of Aëtius, as the 'liberator of the Loire;' and he listened, while yet a youth, to the tidings of the dread struggle at Chalons. But the Frank had already crossed the Rhine, to be driven back no more; and a few years later Sidonius witnessed the occupation of Clermont, afterwards the seat of his own episcopate, by the Gothic invader. In his maturer years he saw the insignia of imperial power transferred from Italy to *Nova Roma*, and the verses are still extant in which he plaintively concedes the inferiority of the western to the eastern capital. He died only four years before the Frankish advance under Clovis upon Soissons.

Circumstances of his age compared with those of that of Ausonius.

That a writer whose lot was cast in such troublous times should have left behind little save elaborate panegyrics, trifling extemporaneous verse, and letters which rarely

Triviality of tone that pervades his writings.

[1] As regards Sidonius, the uncritical optimism of M. Chaix in his *St. Sidoine Apollinaire et son siècle* (2 v. 1866), and the hasty verdict of Niebuhr (*Kleine Schriften*, p. 325), are corrected by Kaufmann's criticisms: see *Inaugural-Dissertation* (Göttingen, 1864) and article in *Schweizer Museum*, 1865. See also observations of J. W. Loebell in his *Gregor von Tours* (ed. 1869), p. 300.

INTROD. bespeak a thoughtful mood will scarcely appear surprising to those who have noted the tendencies of literature at like periods. In their very triviality and frivolity of tone the writings of Sidonius attest the deep despondency that had taken possession of the age. From the stern realities around it is thus that the *littérateur* often seeks to find relief in the exercise of the inventive faculty. It is thus that Boccacio represents his circle of refugees from the plague-smitten city telling their wanton tales. So again the merciless warriors, Garcilaso and Mendoza, sought amusement, in the intervals of massacre and pillage, in the composition of madrigals and sonnets. The *Almanac des Muses*, of the terrible year '93, is said to be as replete with joke and witticism as any that went before or followed.[1] We have, however, sufficient evidence that Sidonius was in no way insensible to the real significance of the events of his time. In a manner that he could hardly himself explain he would seem to have been forlornly conscious that the power and vitality of former times had departed. 'God,' he exclaims, 'gave strength in other measure to bygone generations.' He more than once betrays a melancholy presentiment that the very extinction of learning is approaching. In a letter to Arbogast, a resident in the Moselle district, he expresses his delight that in the noble heart of his correspondent the literary spirit, 'now dying out,' still finds a refuge. As for himself, his muse, he elsewhere confesses, falters before the depressing influences of the time. 'How,' he asks, 'can I write six-feet hexameters when surrounded by seven-feet barbarians?'

His literary sympathies opposed to the theory prevalent in the Church in his time.

Regarded as a bishop of the Church, there is much, it must be admitted, in Sidonius that harmonises but indifferently with either the primitive or the modern conception. His own theory of the office seems to have been rather that of a political chieftain than a spiritual guide, and his effusive admiration of the career of Apollonius of Tyana is certainly a singular and somewhat puzzling feature. He was evidently of opinion that classic culture might, in judicious hands, prove a valuable weapon of the Church We find

[1] Ampère, ii 238.

him, for example, writing to the semi-Pelagian bishop Faustus in terms of almost fulsome flattery respecting a treatise on the materiality of the soul, which the bishop had composed in answer to Claudian Mamertus. Sidonius assures him that 'he has *pressed pagan science and philosophy into the service of the Church*, and has attacked the enemies of the faith with their own weapons.'[1] It probably marks, however, the prevailing tendency to an opposite theory that he implicitly admits, in another passage, that the study of pagan literature, though permissible as a recreation in earlier life, is unbecoming in the ecclesiastic of mature years. 'Improve your opportunities, young men,' he exclaims, 'and take your fill of Horace and Cicero. When age comes upon you, you must turn your thoughts to things eternal, and leave the ancient pagans alone. Now, however, use your time!'

That theory had not yet succeeded in finding complete expression in practice.

It is evident indeed that the influences which were to result in a remodelling of the whole scheme of Christian education had not as yet come fully into operation. Sidonius himself speaks of the pleasure he had derived from reading a play of Terence with one of his sons, and comparing the Roman copy with the Greek original of Menander. In another letter he reminds one of the friends of his youth, how he, the latter, had been wont of old 'to assume the garb of the Greek sophist' when studying the categories of Aristotle, and alludes to 'the nets which Aristotle spreads by means of his syllogisms.' A third letter contains an interesting account of the library possessed by his friend Ferreol of Nismes. The volumes appear to have been divided into three divisions. Of these the first was set apart for the use of the women, and was exclusively composed of Christian literature. The second contained only pagan literature, and was open only to the men. The third, including books of both kinds, was accessible to both sexes. The library was also a rendezvous for literary and philosophic discussions.[2] But, in fact, there can be little doubt that in the time of Sidonius, and even in

[1] Chaix, ii 49–54; Kaufmann (see p. 16, note 1), p. 33.
[2] Ib. i 214.

INTROD.

the succeeding generation, the ancient culture still exercised considerable influence. The names of Ennodius, bishop of Pavia, the poet Constantius, St. Avitus, bishop of Vienne, St. Hilary of Arles, Felix, the rhetorician of Clermont, St. Remy himself, are all those of men educated in the imperial schools, and who either insensibly reflected, or still regarded with a favour they could but imperfectly disguise, the old rhetorical training. The decisive and final overthrow of these traditions in Gaul is to be referred to a twofold influence—an influence from without, the Frankish invasion and conquest—and an influence from within, the rise of the monastic schools under the rule put forth by Cassian.

Final overthrow of the Roman or pagan traditions.

It was far from mere hyperbole when one of the panegyrists of the fourth century represented his fellow countrymen as ever watching, with anxious eye, the waters of the Rhine—rejoicing when the broad current rolled in fuller volume, and trembling when it fell. For a long time it had seemed their tutelary guardian against Frankish invasion. But already in the fourth century the Frank had permanently crossed the barrier. In 398, Trèves, the metropolis of northern Gaul, had been burnt to the ground; and in 445 the conquest of Cambrai by Clodion, to which the arms of Aëtius offered but a temporary check, extended the domain of the Salian Franks to the Somme. At Chalons, Franks contended on either side; but in the year 486 came the memorable march of Clovis upon Soissons, and thenceforth the history of Gaul is for the greater, certainly for the most interesting, part that of another race.

The Frankish invasion and conquest.

In almost every respect the characteristics of the conqueror stand in striking contrast to the influences which had previously shaped the destinies of Gaul. He brought with him none of that refined civilisation and speculative philosophy wherewith the Greek had stirred and humanised the great cities of the South. Lawless indeed he was not; but his Salic Code was at best but a rough and incoherent conception when compared with that imperial system which extorted his admiration in the subjugated land. In all the arts that minister to social enjoyment, in all the higher cul-

The Frank and the Gallo-Roman compared.

ture that dignifies existence and mitigates even the loss of liberty, he was incomparably inferior to the Gallo-Roman over whom his conquest was so easy and so rapid. Yet, notwithstanding, in these stalwart Franks, issuing from their forest lands and morass-guarded homes, we recognise something more than mere superiority of brutish force and savage energy. Their love of freedom was unconquerable. From the time when the genius of Caesar overthrew Ariovistus, they had rarely ceased to trouble and disquiet the Empire. Tacitus himself could not but note that Arminius dared to provoke the wrath of Rome, not like other kings and chieftains as she rose to power, but in the fulness of her imperial might. Combined with this ineradicable love of liberty was another sentiment which lent to their long resistance additional force. Their simple habits of life and rude morality inspired them with fierce contempt for the vices and the whole civilisation of the Empire. The relations of the *family*—that primeval institution to which scientific investigation refers back the origin of the most hallowed sentiments of the human race—were cherished by them with a fidelity that offered a complete antithesis to vices like those that moved the satire of Juvenal and Persius. Womanhood was respected and protected; veracity was held in honour; even slavery, as it existed in their midst, would scarcely seem to have been more grievous than the condition of an English agricultural labourer at the commencement of the present century. That spirit of individuality, which Guizot regards as their chief contribution to the common stock of civilized conceptions, becomes increasingly apparent as they are to be seen entering upon a settled mode of life. As the German honoured his wife and loved his children, so he found his main happiness in his home. Hence that more isolated manner of living, which to the Latin seemed mere unsociable moroseness. The crowded thoroughfares, the theatres, the games, the enervating dissipation amid which the inhabitants of the Gallic and Italian cities frittered away the strength and dignity of manhood, had for the German no charm. He built no cities, but fixed his little homestead near some perennial

INTROD. stream, amid fruitful pastures, shut in by woodland, and there ruled supreme over his family and dependants. Living thus very near to Nature and rendering a rude instinctive obedience to her laws, he received from her as his reward a robust and powerful frame, and exulted in an invigorating sense of freedom which, unlettered and unrefined though he was, enabled him to look down with not all-unmerited scorn on the degenerate races whom he subdued.

The Frankish conquest not altogether destructive.

The most authoritative and recent research tends rather to contravene the representations of those writers who, like Thierry, have depicted the Frankish conquest as an overwhelming and eminently destructive invasion of a barbaric host. The arms of Clovis can scarcely be said to have subjugated the people south of the Loire; and even the northern provinces were reduced only by a process of successive occupations. The cities were many of them burnt; the farms were overrun and pillaged; but the municipal institutions of the Gallic race survived in the one case, their commercial and industrial habits in the other. Above all, Christianity, so far from being extinguished, as in Britain, achieved in turn a conquest over the conqueror. The military victory at Soissons was compensated by the spiritual triumph symbolised by the baptism of Clovis at Rheims.

Salvian, *d.* circ. 495.

Among those who, in the earlier part of the century, had fled before the invader, when the flaming cities on the Rhine and the Moselle told of the advance of Clodion, was the celebrated Salvian. It is conjectured that he was a native of Cologne and received his first training at Trèves; and his writings undeniably afford conclusive evidence that he had early become deeply imbued with the rhetorical culture for which the latter city was famed. He found a refuge in Marseilles, and there formed an acquaintance with Hilary of Arles, Eucherius, bishop of Lyons, and others who, as we have seen, still sustained the traditional learning of southern Gaul. It was not, however, to resume, in a more tranquil atmosphere, the studies of his youth that Salvian had fled to Marseilles. His ardent and imaginative spirit was stirred to its very depths by the calamities that had overtaken the

country of his birth; the aspect of the times cast a gloom over his whole nature. He believed that it was but the beginning of the end—the end of the Roman polity, the Roman civilisation, the Roman learning; and he looked upon such a sequel as nothing more than a long-merited retribution for the wanton abuse of power and almost universal demoralisation that characterised his age. Like Augustine in his *De Civitate Dei*, like Orosius in his History, the presbyter of Marseilles, in his turn, put forth the *De Gubernatione Dei*, to point the moral of contemporaneous history,

INTROD.

His despair of his own countrymen.

The *De Gubernatione Dei*.

—'and justify the ways of God to man.'

It was in the same year that the battle of Chalons was fought that Salvian is said to have commenced his treatise, and in its turbid eloquence and abrupt transitions we seem to see the reflex of the tumult around. 'Ye complain, Romans,' is his cry, 'because the barbarian crushes you; but ye complain without right, for ye merit all your woes.' 'These barbarians,' he fiercely adds, 'are as good as you, and even better.'[1] Christianity itself seemed to him powerless to reform a state of society thus utterly corrupt; it was in the barbaric element that his hopes of a regenerated and reinvigorated Europe really centered. Among the Latin races he could discern nothing but corruption, vice, and crime: the hand of authority stretched out only to oppress—the riches of the wealthy squandered in sensual and debasing pleasures—the needy, despairing of justice against the employer and of honest recompense of labour, betaking themselves to the recesses of the forest and the mountain to assume the career of the brigand. While in the midst of this widespread, this almost universal, lawlessness and demoralisation, when the Vandal was triumphing in Africa and the Frank was marshalling his forces for a final descent upon Gaul, the denizen of the great cities, reckless of the morrow, shouted, and applauded in the theatre and the circus—*inter suorum supplicia ridebat*.[2] 'Ye ask for public games, ye citi-

[1] *De Gub. Dei*, IV 12; Migne, liii 84: 'Ubi sublimior est praerogativa, major est culpa,' says Salvian.

[2] *Ibid.* VI 12; Migne, liii 123.

INTROD. zens of Trèves! After bloodshed and executions, ye clamour for shows. Ye demand of your prince a circus—and for whom? For a pillaged and ruined city, for a captive and plundered people, decimated and in tears!'[1]

To the despondency thus produced in the minds of the teachers of the age by the combined spectacle of deepest social corruption and the severest national calamity, must in a great degree be attributed the disposition, now generally discernible, to abandon the ancient system of instruction—a disposition which was still further increased by the change in popular feeling. As the majority of the people became Christian by profession, and learning declined in estimation, their prejudices, once so strong against the faith which they subsequently embraced, became directed against all pagan institutions and habits of thought. Legislation, which Constantine had invoked to protect the Christian instructor, was needed in turn to protect the professor of rhetoric from persecution. Even those who, like Sedulius, Claudius Marius Victor, and Prosper, sought to impart a Christian tone to the traditional culture by applying it to new themes, found that, in the temper of the times, this middle course was impracticable.

Change in popular feeling with respect to paganism.

It was precisely as this change in popular sentiment began to find expression, that the rise of the schools of Cassian afforded, in connexion with the monastic foundations, an escape from the previously existing dilemma. A system —narrow, illiberal, and defective, it must be confessed, but still a system—of education was presented which rendered the rejection of the old discipline less difficult. The choice no longer lay between the methods of paganism and the sacrifice of all methods whatever.

Rise of the schools of Cassian.

Monasticism, as is well known, is of oriental origin; but the spirit which it breathed and the discipline which it enforced in the East differ in many important respects from those which characterised it in western Christendom. Its dominant conception was familiar to eastern communities long before the Christian era, associated apparently, if not identical, with that theory of the contemplative life which in

The monasticism of the West:

[1] *De Gub. Dei*, VI 16; Migne, liii 126.

the oriental philosophies was regarded as the loftiest ideal of human existence, and whose influence is especially discernible in the doctrines of the Neo-Platonists. In the West, however, there is no evidence that monasticism was ever known save in conjunction with the Christian faith, while in its passage from tropical to temperate regions its discipline became inevitably modified by those conditions and limitations which natural laws impose on all theories of morality and life. The inertia which to the denizen of India, Syria, and Egypt might seem only repose, was irksome and even painful to the inhabitant of Gaul. A Simeon Stylites, passing whole years on the summit of a lofty column, exposed to all the vicissitudes of the seasons, became a physical impossibility. Even the abandonment of all active pursuits was felt by the energetic races of the North as an almost intolerable penance. Hence, while the solitary member of the Therapeutae, and the cenobite of Egypt under the rule of Antony and Pacomius, to whom their own spiritual welfare was proposed as the sole aim of existence, remained, for the most part, unsociable, unproductive, and unbeneficent members of the human race, the monk of the West became the cultivator of the soil, the preserver of letters, the teacher of the people.

antithesis it presents to the eastern theory.

So completely however, in its assumption of duties of this character, did monasticism depart from its primary conception, that an eminent critic has not hesitated to assert that 'the monk accomplished his mission by ignoring the very principle of original monachism.'[1] It is the first stage in this important revolution, marked by the monastic rule of Cassian, that now claims our attention.

With respect to the country of which Cassian, who was born about the middle of the fourth century, was a native, there exists considerable doubt. His classic learning, the tenour of a casual reference, and the frequency with which the name of Germanus, his friend, occurs in the history of Gaul at this period, would incline us to conclude that he was born in Marseilles, the city in which his latter life was spent; but it is certain that he was brought, very early in life, under

Main facts in the life of Cassian.

[1] Haddan, *Remains*, p. 203.

INTROD. the influence of eastern monasticism. His youthful imagination was fascinated by the fame of that remote and solitary region of the Thebaïs, where, in strange contrast to the prevailing tone of society in the fourth century, the saintly and contemplative life was lived with almost unprecedented austerity. Along with Germanus he penetrated to those burning solitudes. The enthusiasm of the youthful adventurers was in no way diminished by what they there heard and witnessed; and, during a residence of ten years in Palestine and in Egypt, they both submitted to the ascetic discipline and ratified their choice by their mature sanction. It was not until the year 404 that Cassian returned to mingle again with men; but the reputation acquired by his previous life at once marked him out for distinguished service in the Church, and he was forthwith appointed on a mission from Constantinople to Rome which had for its main object the suppression of the Arian heresy. He does not appear, after this time, to have returned to the East, but took up his residence at Marseilles. There, in his *Collationes*, he committed to writing the record of conversations which, in former years, he and Germanus had held with eminent anchorites and fathers of the East. There also he founded the famous monastery of St. Victor, and assisted in that of the yet more celebrated society on the neighbouring island of Lérins; while in the volume of his *Institutiones* he drew up the rules for their observance—a code which, down to the time when it gave place to that of St. Benedict, is to be regarded as the law of monasticism in Gaul. Hitherto, as he himself tells us, that law had been vague and fluctuating; every monastery had a rule of its own: to Cassian therefore is to be ascribed the original character of those institutions which, for good or for evil, have exercised so powerful an influence on the history of Christianity in Europe.

His *Collationes* and *Institutiones*.

The distrust shewn by the Church of his day of pagan learning was fully shared, perhaps largely increased, by Cassian, but it is evident that his sentiments were not dictated by the aversion of unlettered ignorance. The disciple of St. Chrysostom, he had in his youth studied ardently the

masterpieces of Greek learning and eloquence; and in after life he found it easier to deplore than to shake off their early fascination. In one of his *Collationes* his friend Germanus is represented as consulting the abbat Nestorus on the best means of expelling the recollections of profane authors from the mind. He complains that even in the hours of devout meditation these memories will often intrude. The poetic strains, the idle stories, the martial narratives of this forbidden literature rise up and distract his soul. They drag him down from heavenly contemplations; tears are unavailing to wash them away.[1] The reply of the abbat is not ill-conceived. 'Read,' he says, 'the sacred books with the same ardour that thou once didst those of heathen writers—and then thou shalt be freed from the influence of the latter.' An ominous reply, however, as Kaufmann justly observes, for the fate of letters in the monasteries of Gaul.

His teaching with respect to pagan literature.

The sanctification of the heart was Cassian's professed aim; and we find him contrasting the spiritual elevation and profitable thoughts which the discipline of the monastery under his guidance would be likely to develope in its members, with the barren teaching of the rhetorician. Nowhere indeed is the influence of his oriental experiences more clearly to be discerned than in his theory of the right method of arriving at divine truth. He cast aside the commentators and directed his monks to give themselves to fasting, prayer, and meditation, in order to attain to an enlightened understanding of Scripture.[2] Such an understand-

His theory in relation to the study of the Scriptures.

[1] '. . . nunc mens mea poeticis vel infecta carminibus, illas fabularum nugas historiasque bellorum quibus a parvulo primis studiorum imbuta est rudimentis, orationis etiam tempore meditetur, psallentique, vel pro peccatorum indulgentia supplicanti aut impudens poematum memoria suggeratur, aut quasi bellantium heroum ante oculos imago versetur, taliumque me phantasmatum imaginatio semper eludens, ita mentem meam ad supernos intuitus aspirare non patitur, ut quotidianis fletibus non possit expelli.' *Collatio* XIV, c. 12 (Migne, xlix 74).

[2] 'Monachum ad Scripturarum notitiam pertingere cupientem nequaquam debere labores suos erga commentatorum libros impendere, sed potius omnem mentis industriam et intentionem cordis erga emundationem vitium carnalium detinere. Quibus expulsis confestim cordis oculi, sublato velamine passionum, sacramenta Scripturarum velut naturaliter incipient contemplari.

INTROD.

ing, he held, was not easy of attainment, but had purposely been rendered difficult in order that its very possession might serve to distinguish the sanctified from unregenerate natures. The purport of the Scriptural narrative, which he designated as the historical sense, was, he admitted, obvious to all: it was written that he that ran might read. But beyond or within this lay hidden what he termed a tropological sense; then an allegorical, and finally an anagogical, sense;[1] and these different senses revealed themselves only to him who read with the mental illumination proceeding from a sanctified and purified heart. Such illumination, such Scriptural knowledge, were regarded by Cassian as the ultimate aim of the monastic discipline, and in comparison with these all other studies sank into insignificance. He does not, indeed, appear altogether to have proscribed knowledge which might prove of service to the learner in enabling him to understand more correctly the historical sense; but as this same historical sense ranked lowest in his estimation, so all studies that were subsidiary to this alone suffered in his view a corresponding depreciation. His theory of the religious life betrays its oriental origin in its marked similarity to the Neo-Platonic theory of the philosophic life; and there is one passage, wherein he adverts to the exaltation of the soul when absorbed in prayer, which recalls very forcibly the ecstasis of Plotinus.

The four Scriptural senses.

But while Cassian undoubtedly regarded the contemplative life as the highest, he seems to have considered, like Aristotle, that the active life was indispensable as a preliminary to the more advanced stage. He held with the eastern proverb, that the industrious spirit is assailed by but one devil—the idle, by a legion. Hence laborious duties and hard, even painful, toil were strictly enjoined upon the monk. When not occupied with religious services or the study of the Bible, he was bound to devote himself to pre-

He enjoins active and laborious duties on the monk.

Institutiones, v 34. The sense, Cassian held, was often revealed in dreams. *Collat.* xiv 10.

[1] '. . . in duas dividitur partes, id est, in historicam interpretationem et intelligentiam spiritalem . . . Spiritalis autem scientiae genera sunt, tropologia, allegoria, anagoge.' *Coll.* viii 3.

scribed menial tasks. The severity of the labour thus imposed, especially during the novitiate, is one of the harshest features of Cassian's rule, and was wisely mitigated by St. Benedict. INTROD.

The fundamental conception of his rule was in harmony with the whole discipline. Cassian looked upon the monastery as a school where, by the study of the Scriptures and the instruction of their elders, youth were to be educated to a holy life; and just as the studies of the schoolboy are designed to prepare him for the trials and duties of manhood, so the monk, who has renounced the present world and whose aims and hopes are centered in heaven, was to be trained solely with reference to a future existence. The same theory pervades the rule of St. Benedict; it confronts us again, though with a less rigorous interpretation, in the commentary on the Benedictine rule, drawn up by Rabanus Maurus;[1] it was maintained and defended by the eminent Dominican, Thomas Aquinas, Cassian's warm admirer; and, however its interpretation may have been modified or varied, must be regarded as the prevailing theory of the religious education throughout the mediaeval era. The monastery a school for heaven.

The foregoing outline will serve in some measure to explain the fact that, in spite of its affinities to the oriental spirit, the rule of Cassian nevertheless made its way under the domination of the half-Christianised Frank. The Frank could respect a high morality, and in these communities which now began to rise throughout Gaul he found it. He despised the dreaming asceticism of the East, but in the laborious, hard-faring, and self-denying monks of the West there was an energy of resolve and action which accorded with his own nature. The beauties of classic literature and the refinements and subtleties of Gallic culture lay beyond the range of his intellectual appreciation, but the simple Points in which the rule of Cassian harmonised with the Frankish character.

[1] 'Ergo, sicut in schola pueri cum disciplina quae illis necessaria sunt discunt et quae in futuro prosint capiunt, ita et monachi in monasterii regularis schola et quae eos in praesenti honeste vivere faciant et quae in futuro felices reddant, discere sagaciter et efficaciter debent impiere.' Rabanus Maurus, *Comment. in Regulam S. Benedicti, Opera*, vi 257.

INTROD. narrative and moral grandeur of the Gospels and the fervid eloquence of the prophets appealed forcibly to his heart. And thus, notwithstanding the justice of Ozanam's assertion, that monasticism is alien to the genius of the French character—an assertion that may be made with at least equal truth in relation to our English forefathers—monastic foundations in Frankland, as in England, multiplied and grew even in the age of invasion and conquest. As the Frankish supremacy successively extended itself from the Rhine to the Meuse, from the Meuse to the Somme, from the Somme to the Loire, and from the Loire to the Garonne, while the schools of the rhetoricians died out, new monasteries rose throughout the land. Before the close of the fourth century, St. Martin—who may be regarded as the founder of the monastery in Gaul, as Cassian was the author of the monastic discipline—had already instituted the societies of Ligugé near Poitiers and that of Marmoutiers near Tours. Then, with the commencement of the fifth century, there rose under Honoratus, on the island that still bears his name,[1] the monastery which preeminently reflected the best features in Cassian's influence, and from whence proceeded the great majority of those distinguished men who, known as the *Insulani*,[2] still imparted lustre to the history of southern Gaul. From these islands the movement extended itself along the valley of the Rhone, and from Marmoutiers along that of the Loire; so that when, in the latter part of the sixth century, St. Maur introduced the Benedictine rule into Frankland, the monastery was already a familiar institution in Burgundy and Aquitaine. Still charged, however, with much of the original oriental influences, the movement seems to have faltered as it encountered the rude northern blasts; for while 240 monastic communities are enumerated as existing, at this period, in the country south of the Loire, only ten appear to have been as yet founded in the wide tract that lies between the Vosges and the Rhine.

Rapid progress of monasticism in Gaul in the fifth and sixth centuries.

[1] The Isle de St. Honorat, one of the Lérins group off Cannes.

[2] The *Studium Insulanum* was famous in the fifth and sixth centuries; see Bingham, *Eccles. Antiq.* VII ii 14.

The monastic and episcopal schools supplant the municipal schools.

Within the walls of these institutions learning now found its chief, and for a long period almost its only, refuge; while the municipal schools rapidly disappeared before the Frankish advance. They exhibited a culture with which the conqueror had no sympathy, and the cities from which they had formerly derived their support were either laid in ruins, crushed beneath overwhelming imposts, or impoverished by the cessation of commerce. Trade revived and order was in some measure restored, but the Christian proscription continued to oppose an effectual barrier to the reestablishment of pagan education; and the rule of Cassian may be said, in a certain sense, to have seconded the destroying arm of the Frank. Yet, notwithstanding, whatever survived of education and letters undoubtedly owed its preservation to the monasteries and the episcopal schools. If, on the one hand, the Christian teacher suffered once large and fertile tracts in the domain of letters to lie neglected, on the other, he alone guarded and cultivated the narrow portion that still blossomed and bore fruit.

Character of the education here imparted.

The monastic school now began to appear as an almost invariable adjunct to the monastery. Under the severe limitations indicated in the rule of Cassian, the education imparted was of the most elementary and narrowest kind, designed as it was solely for those who were looking forward to the monastic life. The boys were taught to read that they might study the Bible and understand the services; to write, in order that they might multiply copies of the sacred books and of the psalter; to understand music, so that they might give with due effect the Ambrosian chant. Even arithmetic found a place in the course of instruction mainly on the plea that it enabled the learner to understand the *Computus*—that is, to calculate the return of Easter and of the different festivals. In those cities which represented the centres of the different dioceses, a similar system of instruction prevailed in the cathedral schools; but here again it was strictly subordinated to the direct requirements of the priestly office, and aimed at nothing more than to qualify the pupils for the performance of the services of the Church.

INTROD.

In this manner the great revolution was gradually effected. To the municipal school there succeeded the cathedral school; the *grammaticus* of the former was supplanted by the *scholasticus* of the latter; the Christian preacher occupied the place of the professor of rhetoric; the bishop of the Church was at once the head of his diocese, the chief magistrate of the city, the guardian of order, the protector of the defenceless and oppressed. Whatever still survived of moral force, of social influence, of capacity for organisation, when the Frank subjugated Gaul, was to be found sheltering in the monastic cloister, by the episcopal chair, or by the altar of the Church.[1] The shrewdness of Clovis discerned the opportunity; the religious zeal of the Latin clergy hailed the prospect of a decisive triumph over their pagan or Arian antagonists. Hence the memorable compact, pregnant with momentous consequences, not only to Frankland but to all Europe, first ratified when the conqueror bent before the cross uplifted by St. Remy at Rheims —the compact between Teutonic might and the aims and theories of Christian Rome.

Compact between the Teutonic conqueror and the Latin clergy.

The traditions of the schools of Cassian unfavourable to the literary spirit.

The sole surviving agencies of education were thus the school of the monastery and the school of the cathedral,[2] and of these the former undoubtedly, at this period, included the more extended range of instruction. The monastery was still a lay institution and unsubject to the control of the bishop, and the transcription of manuscripts was a recognised occupation among its members. Yet even here the dominant conception, as interpreted by the followers of Cassian, was incompatible with a genuine devotion to letters. In the unreserved subjection of learning to exclusively religious ends and its absorption in an ulterior purpose, was proclaimed the divorce of the literary from the religious spirit. The pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, the dis-

[1] 'Avant l'arrivée des Barbares la puissance du clergé restait seule debout au milieu des ruines de l'empire.' Guizot, *Essais* (13me edit.), p. 185.

[2] The evidence for a third class, *écoles de campagne*, as Guizot styles them, recommended by the Council of Vaison in 529, is too slight to admit of their being regarded as an appreciable element in the culture of the period. Guizot, ii 117; Ampère, ii 260-1.

interested devotion of the intellectual powers to philosophy and speculation, was no longer recognised as commendable or even permissible. 'Il n'y a plus de littérature désintéressée,' says Guizot, 'plus de littérature véritable.'[1]

The whole character of Cassian, together with the bold and lofty traditions of the school which reflected his influence at St. Honorat, forbid us to believe that he would have regarded with satisfaction the decline that waited upon theological learning in the institutions that professed his rule. But, unhappily for his fame, his precepts, like those of not a few other great reformers, were destined to receive at the hands of his successors a harsh, illiberal, and too literal interpretation. Theology, in the monasteries of Gaul, would thus seem to have degenerated to a condition closely resembling that of some more modern experiences. The monk and the priest learned, it is true, to read their Bibles, but no attempt appears to have been made to hand down, along with this elementary instruction, either a sound canon of criticism or an approved interpretation of the sacred writers' meaning, or to assist the student, in any way, in the intelligent study of that meaning for himself. He was consequently at the mercy of every pretender to especial spiritual discernment, however arrogant or unlearned. Cassian himself, we can readily understand, had been, like other eminent contemners of traditional culture, only half conscious how much his judgement was still guided and his fancy controlled by the learning of his youth. The observers of his rule, in the next century, however, were liberated from such restraints; and the scornful prediction of Julian, that the man who exchanged the study of the ancients for that of the Evangelists would sink to the intellectual condition of the slave, was almost verified by the state of many of the monasteries in the period succeeding upon the Frankish conquest. The undisciplined fancy, seizing upon that feature in Cassian's teaching which assigned to nearly every passage a metaphorical as well as a literal or historical sense, distinguished itself by fantastic vagaries and unwarrantable inventions, to parallel which we

Decline of theological learning in these schools.

[1] ii 122.

INTROD. must turn to the wildest extravagancies of the most fanatical and illiterate sects of modern times. If, as can hardly be denied, the attempts to construct a formal system of theology have often proved a perilous task to both teacher and learner, it must also be admitted that the assumed right of individual interpretation, on the part of the unlettered and ignorant, has been attended with yet more deplorable results. But, unfortunately, while the errors into which endeavours of the former kind have fallen are perpetuated in the memory by the ingenuity and ability with which they have been associated, the warning afforded by the irreverent exposition of the illiterate enthusiast is forgotten in the oblivion to which his memory has been consigned.

It would be difficult and of but little interest to trace out the gradual extinction of letters during the period when Austrasia and Neustria, the Frank and the Gallo-Roman, contended for the superiority. Within less than a century after the death of Sidonius Apollinaris, Gregory of Tours compiled his *Historia Ecclesiastica Francorum*. The invidious comparison between the two writers, instituted by Gibbon, is familiar to most scholars. 'Each of them,' he says, 'was a native of Auvergne, a senator, and a bishop. The difference of their style and sentiments may, therefore, express the decay of Gaul, and clearly ascertain how much, in so short a space, the human mind had lost of its energy and refinement.'[1]

Gregory of Tours *b.* 544; *d.* 595.

That Gregory's early training probably included whatever of classic education still lingered in southern Gaul will scarcely be called in question. His writings sufficiently prove that he had acquired some familiarity with Latin authors: his Vergilian quotations are frequent; and, admitting what is perhaps somewhat questionable proof, he would appear, by like evidence, to have been acquainted with Sallust, Pliny, and Aulus Gellius. But the fatal influences of his time are clearly reflected in his own style of Latinity

[1] iv 380. So Ampère: 'entre ces deux hommes, que sépare un espace de quarante années, il y a un abîme. On pourrait dire qu'ils appartiennent à deux âges du monde.' *Hist. Litt.* ii 257.

—in his candid avowal that he is not solicitous to avoid a solecism—in his deferential appeal to the student of the compend of Martianus Capella, as one who might be regarded as learned in the learning of the age—and in his melancholy statement of the motives which have led him to compile his History. 'Inasmuch as,' says the poor bishop, 'the cultivation of letters is disappearing or rather perishing in the cities of Gaul, while good deeds and evil are committed with equal impunity, and the ferocity of the barbarians and the passion of kings rage alike unchecked, so that not a single grammarian skilled in narration can be found to describe the general course of events, whether in prose or in verse, the greater number lament over this state of affairs, saying, "Alas for our age! for the study of letters has perished from our midst, and the man is no longer to be found who can commit to writing the events of the time!" —these and like complaints, repeated day from day, have determined me to hand down to the future the record of the past; and, although of unlettered tongue, I have nevertheless been unable to remain silent respecting either the deeds of the wicked or the life of the good. That which has more especially impelled me to do this is, that I have often heard it said that few people understand a rhetorician who uses philosophical language, but nearly all understand one speaking in the vulgar fashion.'[1]

His testimony to the decay of learning.

With this dismal strain Gregory ushers in his work; and, notwithstanding the efforts of some writers[2] to prove that

His representations confirmed by the internal evidence afforded by his writings.

[1] Migne, lxxi 161. There can be no better comment on this passage than the words of Loebell:—'In der That hatte Gregor Grund genug, die Nachsicht des Lesers für seine Schreibart in Anspruch zu nehmen. Wie sehr sie deren bedarf, bezeugt jede Seite, ja fast jede Zeile seiner Werke. Sie ermangelt nicht nur jeder Freiheit und jeder Feinheit, sondern ist roh, holperig und unbeholfen, bald matt, breit und zerflossen, bald durch das Ungeschick, Worte und Sätze zusammenzufügen, so dunkel, dass man den Sinn mehr errathen als mit Sicherheit bestimmen kann.' *Gregor von Tours*, p. 307. The use of the accusative for the ablative absolute is perhaps the most glaring of Gregory's barbarisms.

[2] Among these Ozanam is one of the most prominent. He contends, notwithstanding Gregory's declarations, that there is good reason for supposing that the condition of letters was far less discouraging than the bishop of Tours would fain represent it to be. He asks (p. 404), 'Comment les

INTROD.

the date of letters was really far more favourable than he would have us believe, and that his lament is little more than the cry invariably raised by the scholar in times of great political disquiet, the candid student can hardly fail to perceive that the internal evidence afforded in the pages of the History is strongly corroborative of the writer's own statement, and that the almost unanimous conclusion of the ablest investigators of the period does not admit of being set aside. It is evident that, apart from other causes, the proscription of pagan literature had done nothing towards bringing about greater mental activity in the field of Christian studies; the literary spirit, though confined in narrower channel rolled only in yet feebler current. Of this fact the frank avowal of Fortunatus, the most conspicuous writer of the doggrel that passed for poetry at this time, is a striking illustration. He had received his education at Ravenna, and the latter part of his life was spent in the service of the Church at Poitiers. But he admits that not only were 'Plato, Aristotle, Chrysippus and Pittacus (a singular jumble!) unknown to him, but that he had not even read Hilary, Gregory, Ambrose, or Augustine.'[1]

Testimony of Fortunatus.

The Merovingian dynasty.

In the midst of this general decline of learning, the Merovingian kings, with the wantonness of a half-barbaric

écoles restaurées par Gratien, célébrées par Ausone et Sidoine Apollinaire, toutes debout au cinquième siècle, après le premier choc de l'invasion, seraient-elles tombées au sixième, sans laisser un historien de leur chute?' The fact probably only serves to show how little of the historical spirit or of literary ability still survived. The instances adduced by Ozanam to prove the contrary are singularly unfortunate. He cites that of Desiderius or Didier of Cahors, who was not born until within a few years of Gregory's death. It is probable that Desiderius was a man of considerable culture; but it appears that his endeavours to instruct his pupils in 'grammar' were of so exceptional a character as to draw upon him the special rebuke of Gregory the Great (see *infra*, p. 77). The next instance cited by Ozanam is that of Paul of Verdun, who died fifty-two years after Gregory of Tours; and the third instance (pp. 405-7) is that of St. Bonitus, who died at the beginning of the eighth century! Facts which have to be sought for at such wide intervals as these implicitly refute the argument they are adduced to support. The 'société polie et lettrée du sixième siècle,' of which Ozanam speaks, and of which he considers the poet Fortunatus to have been 'le représentant le plus fidèle,' had little existence save in his own imagination.

[1] See letter to Bishop Martin, Migne, lxxxviii 180.

despotism, assumed, on the one hand, to dictate the terms of theological belief; on the other, the rules of orthography. Chilperic I drew up for the Church's use a new Confession of Faith, in which he suppressed the distinctions of the Three Persons of the Trinity;[1] while, like another Claudius, he enjoined the use of four additional letters of the alphabet, and is even said to have commanded that all manuscripts which did not embody this startling innovation should be destroyed. He not only deemed himself, like Sigismund, *super grammaticam*, but even *super metricam*, and composed verses which in their reckless defiance of quantities, appear to have caused Gregory himself, certainly not a fastidious critic, to stare and gasp.[2]

State of the Church under this dynasty.

And while, under the Merovingian dynasty, learning almost ceased to exist, the circumstances of the time were such that it may fairly be doubted whether it would ever have revived without some potent external impulse. It had found refuge in the Church and in the monastery, and the condition of these, at the accession of Charles Martel, was one of utter demoralisation. The state of the former in one respect strongly resembled that of the Gallican Church at a later period, in the complete prostration of the clergy beneath the power of the episcopate, an episcopate in the eighth century utterly demoralised and corrupt. It is a significant fact that at the time when the influence of the Church for good was at its lowest, her material prosperity was at its highest. It is supposed that at the end of the seventh century at least one third of the Gallic territory represented Church property.[3] The monarch, with whom the decision in elections to bishoprics really rested, supported the creatures of his choice. 'Let him,' said Childebert, 'who refuses to listen to his bishop and has been excommunicated, endure the eternal condemna-

[1] Gregory, *Hist. Eccles. Franc.* lib. v, c. 45; Migne, lxxi 360–1.

[2] 'Scripsit alios libros idem rex versibus, quasi Sedulius secutus; sed versiculi illi nulli penitus metricae conveniunt rationi.' *Ibid.*

[3] I give this fact on the authority of Perry, *The Franks, from their first Appearance in History to the Death of King Pepin* (Longmans, 1857), p. 469. He refers to Montesquieu, *L'Esprit des Lois*, xxxi 10.

INTROD. tion of God, and let him be excluded for ever from our palace."[1] Sometimes indeed when royalty refused to defer to the interests of the order, it found the combined power of the episcopate superior to its own. 'Our dignity,' said Chilperic, on one occasion, 'our dignity has departed and is transferred to them.' Even to the Frankish nobility a bishopric seemed a valuable prize, dissociated as it was from spiritual duties and accompanied by envied immunities.[2] Ever since the time of Gregory the Great, the Gallic bishops had exercised their authority unrestrained by the pope of Rome. Freed accordingly from all sense of responsibility, and in awe neither of councils nor their metropolitan, they discarded even the visible signs of their profession. They took rank among the wealthier landed proprietors, imitating their habits of life and adopting their interests. They were sportsmen and warriors, and sometimes were to be seen taking part in expeditions of violence and brigandage. The actual relapse of some of the remoter dioceses into paganism is explicitly referred by the monk Jonas to the fatal influence of the episcopal example.

Demoralisation of the episcopal order.

State of the monastic discipline.

The condition of the monasteries was not less deplorable. It had been the injunction of Cassian that they should shut their doors to the bishop, and preserve, as far as possible, a spirit of isolation from ecclesiastical strife and turmoil. The hope of sharing in the Church's wealth and influence had been, however, too strong a temptation, and the monk had gradually ceded many of his peculiar privileges and rights only to find himself under the thraldom of the episcopal jurisdiction. He appealed to the royal or to the papal authority for protection, and purchased it at the cost of the few liberties that yet remained to him.

The servile element in the monasteries.

Another cause largely contributed, at this period, to the decline of the monasteries in the general estimation.[3] They were recruited, to a great extent, from the servile class; and

[1] 'Qui episcopum suum noluerit audire et excommunicatus fuerit perennem condemnationem apud Deum sustineat, et insuper de palatio nostro sit omnino extraneus.' Baluze, i 17.

[2] Guizot, *Essais*, p. 191.

Gregory the Great himself had held that slaves might, under certain circumstances, be beaten or tortured.[1] The relations of the abbat to his monks accordingly closely resembled those of a master to his slaves; and just as, in reference to the latter, the legislator had found it necessary to enact that mutilation and punishment resulting in death were illegal,[2] so, even as late as the Council of Frankfort of 794, an article reminds us that abbats required in like manner to be restrained from blinding or mutilating their monks.[3]

Barbarities of this revolting character, it is true, are far too common a feature throughout the mediaeval era, but in the history of the Merovingian dynasty they present themselves with sickening frequency. The accession of Charles Martel to power brought about the overthrow of the episcopal tyranny, but his so-called work of reformation more closely resembled one of wholesale confiscation, and he looked upon the resources of the Church chiefly as sinews of war, or as means for enabling him to reward his soldiery for past achievements. The inroads of the Saracen completed the work of destruction in the south; and at Autun, Narbonne, and Bordeaux learning was extinguished in the very asylum to which it had fled for refuge.

Charles Martel.

Such were the circumstances under which the first of the Carolingian monarchs assumed the supreme authority. That rich, fertile and populous land, which had so long sustained the traditions of Roman culture even when these had well-nigh vanished from Italy itself, was in turn overshadowed by the darkness of barbaric conquest. The voice of the teacher was silent in the city and in the monastery. The treasures of the ancient literature lay mouldering in neglect, while no inconsiderable portion was irrevocably disappearing from the possession of man.

Prospects of learning at the accession of Pepin-le-Bref.

[1] That is, when convicted of practising magical rites. *Epist.* lxv; Migne, lxxvii 1002.

[2] 'Si magister in disciplina vulneraverit servum vel occiderit . . . qui eluscaverit discipulum in disciplina.' Ulpian, *Digest.* IX ii, 5.

[3] 'Nulla ex culpa monachos abbati caecare aut mutilare licet.' Baluze, I 261.

INTROD. In other lands indeed the signs were not wanting of a great and in some instances a permanent revival. At York and at Canterbury, at Lindisfarne and at Yarrow, and in the monasteries secluded from continental strife within the precincts of Holy Isle, there were to be found enthusiastic scholars and noble libraries. In Italy, on Monte Cassino, learning had set her lamp, there long to burn with surpassing and enduring splendour; from amid the calm solitudes of Squillace in the south and the plains of Lombardy in the north, there shot a faint but hopeful ray; while from beneath the mountains of the Vosges a gleam pierced even the darkness in Frankland, where all was night as yet.

CHAPTER I.

CHARLES THE GREAT AND ALCUIN; OR, THE SCHOOL OF THE PALACE.

CHAP. I.

Towards the commencement of the seventh century, there had appeared at the court of the haughty Brunehaut an Irish monk, the famous St. Columban. He represented a different school of theology from that of the Church with which the Frank had made his compact—a school which will shortly claim considerable attention at our hands. For the present, however, it will suffice to note the influence of Columban as a monastic reformer in Frankland.

St. Columban, *b.* 543; *d.* 615.

His appearance in Austrasia appears to have been nearly coincident with that of St. Maur in Neustria, but his efforts were directed to the establishment of a rule differing widely from that of St. Benedict, and approaching more closely even than that of Cassian to the discipline of the ascetics of the Thebaïs. The ardour of his genius obtained for this rule a temporary acceptance; but, at the period which we are now approaching, the austerity of the life which it enforced had inevitably led to its abandonment for the rule of St. Benedict, which harmonised far better with the climate and temperaments of northern Gaul.[1]

Character of his monastic rule.

In other respects the influence of Columban in Frankland was superseded by that of a yet more eminent reformer—the great St. Boniface, the devoted assertor of the Romish supremacy, the heroic apostle of the faith amid the strongholds of paganism, the energetic advocate of the Benedictine rule, the reformer whose labours paved the way for Alcuin when,

St. Boniface, *b.* 680; *d.* 755.

[1] See on this subject a note 'sur la Règle suivie dans les Monastères Austrasiens,' in Digot's *Histoire du Royaume d'Austrasie*, iv, note 41.

CHAP. I.

forty years later, that famous teacher accepted the invitation of Charles the Great to Aachen.

Foundation of abbey of Monte Cassino, A.D. 528.

During the period that separates the age of Cassian from that of St. Boniface, monasticism and the cause of letters had found a wiser legislator in Italy. Within a few months of the day when Justinian closed the schools of Athens, and Simplicius and Isidore wandered sadly forth into exile and obscurity, the sound of the axe and the hammer was heard on Monte Cassino. On the summit which overlooks the plains through which the Liris steals slowly in long reaches to the sea, arose the walls from whence proceeded the utterances of the 'Sinai of the Middle Ages;'—eloquent mount, speaking from beyond the silent river with voices still audible across the centuries!

Introduction of the Benedictine rule.

The Benedictine Rule—'first and foremost in discretion and clear in style,' as St. Gregory pronounced it—was at once more comprehensive and more definite than any by which it had been preceded. It was in no way designed to supplant the rule of Cassian, whose *Collationes* were especially indicated by Benedict as a text-book[1] for study and second only to the Scriptures in value and edification, but it laid down precise instructions on many points that had before been left discretionary, and invested the whole monastic life with an air of greater solemnity and importance. It prescribed, for the first time, a year's novitiate, after which, if the purpose of the novice remained unchanged, his vow consigned him to a step which was irrevocable. The authority of the abbat was rendered more absolute, and the whole principle of 'obedience' more binding and explicit. The duties of the day were marked out with greater precision, and the regulations as to diet wisely rendered less ascetic. In no respect, however, was the difference from preceding rules so marked as in the provision made for regular daily study. The main energies of the monk were still to be given to active labour, but the grey dawn of the winter day and the meridian heat of summer were allotted to reading; and, in the season of Lent, the time assigned for this purpose was extended. St. Benedict names no authors, only the books of the Old and the New Testaments,

Its leading characteristics.

Provision made for regular study among the monks.

[1] Migne, xlix 45-6.

together with such expositions thereon as 'the most illustrious doctors of the orthodox faith and the Catholic fathers had compiled.'[1]

The privilege and duty of study being thus established, the range within which it might be carried on, narrow as it seemed, admitted of a wide interpretation. Who could say what great doctors and fathers might yet arise? Who could say what heresies and erroneous doctrines they might not be called upon to refute? Such refutations almost necessarily involved the perusal of the refuted treatises, and thus the doors were thrown open to much of pagan and heterodox literature. At the time, indeed, that St. Benedict drew up his rule—a time when the last upholders of pagan philosophy were about to be expelled from Athens, and the last upholder of Roman learning had recently passed forth to a fearful death from the tower of Pavia—there appeared small danger to be apprehended from a revived activity of speculation; but as monasticism secured the leisure and retirement essential to the religious life, so the Benedictine rule enforced the lawfulness and dignity of study, and letters, sheltered alike from the indifference of the laity and the contempt of the Church, lived on as in some charmed enclosure.

Boniface in Frankland.

Such was the rule that Boniface, early in the eighth century, came to restore in Frankland. He came full of the spirit which the great revival under Theodorus had awakened in England—the spirit of loyalty to Rome and reverence for the Benedictine rule.[2] His sorrow and his surprise at the state of the Frankish monasteries and the morals of the clergy surpassed his powers of expression. In an oft-quoted letter to pope Zacharias, written in 742, on the eve of the Council of Saltz, he describes the condition of affairs in unflinching language. For eighty years no council of the Church had met in Frankland; there was no archbishop;

[1] 'Et expositiones earum quae a nominatissimis doctoribus orthodox's et catholicis patribus factae sunt.' *Reg. S. Benedicti*, c. 8; ed. Waitzmann, 1843, p. 32.

[2] Of the foundation at Fulda he writes to Pope Zacharias, 'monachos constituimus sub regula sancti Patris Benedicti viventes.' Migne, lxxxix 778; see also 808; and Life by Willibald, c. 8, ib. p. 607; Pertz, *Legg.* i 17.

CHAP. I.

no one enforced or re-enacted the canonical laws. Deacons and priests alike led lives of open immorality; the bishops, though abstaining from such open scandal, were 'drunkards, injurious, brawlers, bearing arms in regular battle, and shedding with their own hands the blood of their fellow-men, heathen or Christian, no matter.' To use the language of the summons convening the council, 'the law of God and the religion of the Church had gone to ruin under former princes.'[1]

Measures for Church reform.

However little reason we may see for attributing any but purely political motives to Charles Martel, it is certain that his support, and that of his two sons, largely conduced to Boniface's success. The reformer himself candidly admits the fact. The Councils of 742 and 743 restored in some measure the discipline of the Church. The bishops were reduced to obedience; and the 'Act of Secularisation,' though seemingly an encroachment on ecclesiastical privileges, was in reality of signal service in the manner in which it effected the expulsion of the more unworthy members of the episcopal order. Upon the whole order indeed a heavy penalty was imposed. Deeply scandalised at the spirit of lawless license which they exhibited, Boniface seems to have concluded that no expedient was to be left untried to reduce them to a position of immediate and strict accountability to Rome.[2] Hence, in the first German Christian Council ever held, and summoned through his instrumentality, one of the earliest measures was formally to recognise the complete subjection of the Frankish Church to the Roman See;[3] his own oath of fidelity, taken twenty years before, had admitted in unequivocal language the special powers and privileges vested

[1] 'Quomodo lex Dei et ecclesiastica religio recuperetur, quae in diebus praeteritorum principum dissipata corruit.' Migne, lxxxix 807.

[2] Guizot pronounces in favour of Boniface's disinterestedness (ii 253–4), but at the same time admits 'il est impossible de soumettre plus formellement à la papauté la nouvelle Eglise, les nouvelles peuples chrétiens.' Milman also pronounces his allegiance to Rome 'filial not servile.' 'Had it not been for the reformation begun by Boniface,' says professor Stubbs, 'and worked out by the Karolings, the Gallican Church might have sunk to the level of the Italian or Byzantine.' *Const. Hist.* i 8.

[3] Cossart, iii 1025; Migne, lxxxix 765.

CHAP. I.

in St. Peter and his successors;[1] and the famous abbey at Fulda, which rose under his auspices, and was, in his later years, his most cherished retreat, is the first, and an eminently notable, example of the transfer of monastic allegiance from what was then the tyranny of the episcopate to the papal jurisdiction and authority.[2] These new relations, again, were further strengthened and consolidated by the community of interests established between the Roman pontiff and the Carolingian dynasty. The Frankish monarch became the devoted son of the Church. He protected her from sacrilege and enriched her with temporal power. Confronted by his aegis, the insolent Lombard turned back from the walls of Rome. To the league ratified by Clovis and St. Remy, between the Frankish power and the Latin faith, was now added the compact between the same power and the ecclesiastical conceptions of Rome, signalised, on the one hand, by the consecration of king Pepin by Boniface at Rheims, and on the other, by the gift of the Exarchate. 'Of all nations under heaven,' wrote Stephen, when he summoned Pepin to his aid, 'the Franks are highest in the esteem of St. Peter: to me you owe all your victories.' 'From thenceforth,' says Milman, with something of rhetorical exaggeration, but with substantial truth, 'from thenceforth Christianity had assumed the complete power, not only of the life to come, but of the present life, with all its temporal advantages. It now leagued itself with barbarians, not to soften, to civilise, to imbue with devotion, to lead to Christian worship; but to give victory in all their ruthless wars, to confer the blessings of heaven on their schemes of ambition and conquest. The one title to eternal life is obedience to the Church—the Church no longer the community of pious and holy Christians,

Foundation of abbey at Fulda.

Alliance between Rome and the Carolingian dynasty.

[1] *Juramentum quo S. Bonifacius se Gregorio II Papae astrinxit*: . . . nullo modo me contra unitatem communis et universalis ecclesiae, suadente quopiam, consentire, sed, ut dixi, fidem et puritatem meam atque concursum, tibi et utilitatibus tuae Ecclesiae, cui a Domino Deo *potestas ligandi solvendique* data est, et praedicto vicario tuo atque successoribus ejus, per omnia exhibere. Migne, lxxxix 803.

[2] 'On ne rencontre jusques-là aucun exemple semblable.' Guizot, ii 111.

CHAP. I.

but the see, almost the city, of Rome. The supreme obligation of man is the protection and enlargement of her domain.'[1]

It is not without reason that, throughout the vicissitudes of fortune which Rome has experienced in the long history of her endeavour to assert these claims over the different states of Europe, the name of St. Boniface has ever been dear to her most enthusiastic defenders, and that, in the profuseness of their gratitude, they have sought to associate his name not merely with the reformation of the Frankish Church, but with the very Christianity itself of the state.[2]

Influence of Boniface with respect to education.

St. Boniface, as is well known, fell a victim to his missionary zeal in Friesland—a martyrdom that largely enhanced the veneration for his memory and the authority of his teaching. To Pepin's eldest son, Charles, who at that time was in his thirteenth year, the name of the great English apostle—who had won multitudes from paganism to the true faith, who had restored discipline to the Church, and whose holy hands had poured the consecrated oil on his father's head at Rheims—must ever have seemed surrounded by a halo of superhuman virtues. For learning itself Boniface had effected little, though famed as a scholar in his day. He composed, it is said, a treatise on the eight parts of speech[3] and was believed to be a master of the metrical art; he also appears to have been distinguished as a theologian of the mystic school of Cassian.[4] Of the general direction of his influence therefore there can be no

[1] Milman, iii 24.

[2] The opposite view, which exhibits Boniface as the author of the sacrifice of the freedom of the German Church to the interests of Rome, has recently been maintained, though with little breadth of view, by a German Protestant writer; see *Bonifacius der Apostel der Deutschen, und die Romanisirung von Mitteleuropa.* By A. Werner. Leipzig, 1875.

[3] The treatise is printed in the seventh volume of Mai's *Auctores Classici*, and occupies seventy-four pages. The learned editor observes, 'Bonifacium parum oppido de penu suo in hanc opellam contulisse cognovi, sed eam potius ex Charisio aliisque grammaticis consarcinasse.' *Praef.* p. 11. As the treatise is mentioned neither by Willibald nor Othlo, some doubt may reasonably attach to its genuineness.

[4] '. . . tam grammaticae artis eloquentiae et metrorum medullatae facundia modulatione, quam etiam historiae simplici expositione et spiritualis tripartita intelligentiae interpretatione imbutus.' Willibald, c. 2.

doubt, as strongly favouring a revival of letters as well as of discipline. The fourteen years that intervened between the death of Boniface and that of Pepin-le-Bref, occupied as they were with the war in Lombardy, and that against the Saracens in the south, left however no leisure for schemes of internal reform; and when, in 768, Charles, then in his twenty-sixth year, succeeded to the crown, similar distractions,—as his youthful energy and military genius successively encountered the Lombard, the Saxon, and the Saracen,—continued to interpose between the royal designs and the improvement of the people.

Accession of Charles, 768.

At last a breathing space arrived. The Lombard had been driven from the Exarchate, and new pledges of fidelity to Rome had ratified the traditional policy of Charles' dynasty. His own passion for invasion had been severely checked at Roncesvalles. The Saxon had been smitten hip and thigh on the Lippe and the Elbe. It was at this juncture that the Frankish monarch paid his second visit to Italy, in 780. The Christmas of that year was passed by him at Pavia, the Lombard capital; and during the following Easter, his son Pepin was anointed and crowned king of Italy by pope Adrian at Rome.[1]

He meets Alcuin at Parma.

It would appear to have been in the interval between these last two events that Charles and Alcuin met at Parma. It was not the first time that they had met. In passing through Frankland, in the year 768, Alcuin, who was returning from Rome in the company of his teacher Elbert, archbishop of York, had visited the Frankish court, and had probably then become known to Charles as a rising English scholar.

His previous efforts in the cause of letters.

During the twelve years that had elapsed since that time, Charles had not been altogether inactive in the cause of letters. He had himself acquired something of polite learning from an elderly Italian, one Peter of Pisa, who had held office as instructor in the palace at Aachen under Pepin-le-Bref.[2] Through the assistance of Peter, he had also about this time obtained the services of an eminent Lombard scholar, the celebrated Paulus Diaconus.

[1] Einhard, *Annales* (Pertz, I 161).

[2] Lebeuf, p. 372.

CHAP. I.

Paulus Diaconus.

The reputation acquired by the author of the History of the Lombards has aroused the jealousies of Latin and Teutonic partisans alike; but, without affecting to arrive at a decision where the facts cannot with certainty be known, we may be guided by probability to a definite conclusion. Neither the version which represents the noble Lombard as the bitter enemy of the Frankish conqueror and even a conspirator against his throne, nor that which exhibits him as Charles' confidant and zealous cooperator in the work of reconstructing education, seems in harmony with the known facts. It is certain that Paul, from family ties and political sympathies, must have regarded the ascendency of the Frankish power with feelings of bitter humiliation; but it is also beyond dispute that he resided both at Thionville and Metz, and rendered a certain amount of assistance to Charles in the latter's schemes of reform.[1] But though it is easy to understand that he might undertake to teach Greek to certain of the clergy at Metz and to correct the text of breviaries,[2] we cannot but suppose that residence at the conqueror's court, amid the haughty Frankish nobility, would have been repugnant to his feelings, and that a lively sense of injustice and humiliation would render the familiar relations between a teacher and his pupils a matter of some difficulty. His retirement, in 787, to Monte Cassino may naturally be referred to a sentiment common among the finer intellects of the period—that of weariness of the world. It was there that Paul composed his History of the Lombards,—a work which, notwithstanding its monastic origin, has extorted the reluctant acknowledgements of Gibbon; while the task of restoring learning in Frankland devolved, fortunately, upon one who stood in happier relations to the monarch and the people.

It was in the year 781 that Charles and Alcuin met at Parma. The latter was on an august errand—that of conveying the *pallium* from pope Adrian to his friend and school-

[1] See an able article by F. Wachter in Ersch u. Gruber, sec. iii, pt. 14, pp. 209–17.

[2] See infra, p. 101.

follow Eanbald, the newly created archbishop of York. Eanbald and Alcuin had been educated together at the famous monastery school at York,[1] a school distinguished by the fidelity with which it sustained the scholarly traditions of Theodorus and Paulinus. Their chief instructor had been Elbert, who had afterwards been raised to the archiepiscopal throne, and after filling it for twelve years had just retired in favour of Eanbald. Over both his disciples he appears to have exercised a remarkable influence. He was a scholar whom a passion for books and the love of learning had often impelled to visit the monasteries on the Continent,[2] and we can hardly doubt that Alcuin's like tastes were derived in no small measure from his preceptor.

Teachers at York: Elbert and Eanbald.

It is easy to conjecture that Charles' penetrating genius at once recognised in the still young and vigorous English ecclesiastic the promise of more effectual aid than he had hitherto been able to obtain. Peter of Pisa was now a tottering old man; Paulus Diaconus, an impracticable Lombard. Neither seems to have sought to conceal his contempt for the rude vigour and unlettered notions of the Frank,[3] and Paul probably looked upon the conqueror with much the same feelings as those with which an Athenian sophist of the second century before Christ regarded Metellus or Mummius. Both looked upon the ascendency of the Frank as that of an almost barbaric power. It was otherwise with Alcuin. Between the English and the Frankish

[1] Alcuin's own language seems to imply that his education was commenced and completed under the same masters:—'Vos fragiles infantiae meae annos materno fovistis affectu; et lascivum puericiae tempus pia sustinuistis patientia et paternae castigationis disciplinis ad perfectam viri edocuistis aetatem.' Migne, c 146. It would probably be equally correct to speak of the school as the cathedral school, for at this time monks and canons in England appear to have lived together indiscriminately. See Stubbs, Pref. to *De Inventione*, p. vi. Alcuin's biographer says of Elbert (c. 6), 'erat siquidem ei ex nobilium filiis grex scholasticorum.'

[2] 'Non semel externas peregrino tramite terras
Jam peragravit ovans, sophiae deductus amore,
Si quid forte novi librorum seu studiorum,
Quod secum ferret terris reperiret in illis.'
Alcuin, *Poema de Pontificibus Ecclesiae Eboracensis*, Migne, ci 845.

[3] Monnier, p. 66.

CHAP. I.

race there were strong ethnic affinities, and ever since the time of St. Boniface the intercourse between the two had been more frequent and important. Northumbria, as her star waned before that of Mercia, had more than once been aided by the Frankish power, while the relations between Charles and Offa had not, as yet, assumed a hostile character. If the Northumbrian scholar would but prove to Frankland but half as true a benefactor as the great apostle from Wessex had been, small need would there be to seek among the somewhat supercilious literati beyond the Alps for help in the work of reform.

Position of Alcuin at York.

On Alcuin's side, again, there existed an unfeigned admiration for Charles' genius and character; while, if we may accept the statement of his biographer, the aged Elbert had prophesied, when near his end, that his disciple would find in Frankland a sphere of wide and honourable service in the cause of the Church.[1] Under these circumstances it is not surprising that Alcuin acceded to a proposal, strongly urged and accompanied by no ordinary inducements, that he should exchange the office of *scholasticus* at York for that of instructor of the school attached to Charles' court. It was necessary, however, that the consent of both his archbishop and the king should be given to such a step, and with this reservation Alcuin parted from Charles at Parma. On his arrival in England he sought and obtained the desired permission, Eanbald stipulating simply that his departure should not be regarded as final; and thus, in the year 782, Alcuin again crossed the Channel and was installed as teacher of the school at Aachen.

He accepts the office of instructor of the palace school.

The history of Charles the Great, it has been said by a high authority, enters into that of every modern European state;[2] with equal truth it may be asserted that the history of the schools of Charles the Great has modified the whole

[1] 'Romam volo venias, indeque revertens visites Franciam; novi enim multum te ibi facere fructum.' *Alcuini Vita*, c. 5, Migne, c 97. Elbert's death appears to have almost immediately preceded Alcuin's second journey to Rome and must consequently be assigned to November 6, 780, not 781 or 782, as given by Dixon, *Fasti Eboracenses*, i 106.

[2] Palgrave, i 24.

subsequent history of European culture. It will accordingly be an enquiry of no trifling moment if we endeavour to ascertain, with some precision, the extent, character, and tendencies of the learning which Alcuin had acquired at York, and was now about to disseminate in Frankland with, as we shall hereafter see good reason for concluding, but little colouring from his individual genius.

The episcopal or cathedral school at York.

The school of York, at the time that Alcuin became a pupil there, was scarcely inferior in reputation to that of Canterbury. If the archiepiscopal city of Cantia could recall the patronage of a Gregory the Great, that of Northumbria could point to the presence of a Paulinus. If the former might claim to be the nurse of English learning, the latter would seem to have long been that learning's more distinguished supporter; and though, with the redistribution of dioceses initiated by Theodore, the primate of the south had acquired an influence far superior to that of his northern brother, the diminution in ecclesiastical power at York was perhaps accompanied by a more unselfish devotion to letters.[1]

Its tradition of learning.

The tradition of the learning which Alcuin there acquired is directly stated by his anonymous biographer to have been that handed down by St. Benedict, St. Gregory, St. Augustine, St. Cuthbert, and Theodorus; and the statement is confirmed by Alcuin's own account in his well-known poem, *De Pontificibus et Sanctis Ecclesiae Eboracensis.* The first feature in this learning that arrests the attention is the contrast it presents, in common with the Church discipline of the land, to all the other characteristics of Anglo-Saxon life in the eighth century, as a non-Teutonic element. In every other respect the country that gave Alcuin to the Franks was German, more German indeed than at that time was Germany herself. She had preserved, as yet, almost intact from feudal (that is to say, Frankish) influences her primitive common law. Among the earliest specimens of the Low-German tongue is the famous song, to which Alcuin when a boy may oft have listened in his father's hall, that tells of the achievements of Beowulf. The customs of

[1] Stubbs, *Const. Hist.* i 218–9; Milman, ii 236.

CHAP. I.

Mercia and Northumbria resemble far more faithfully than those of Neustria or Austrasia the picture drawn by the Roman historian of the common fatherland. But when we turn to the library at York and to the training which Alcuin received at the cathedral school, we discern a totally different element, and one that will well repay a somewhat lengthened examination.

The teaching of Gregory the Great.

It was but a few years after the time when Gregory of Tours uttered his doleful lament over the decay of learning in Frankland, that his more illustrious contemporary, Gregory the Great, laid the foundations of learning in England. In estimating the character of that learning, it should never be forgotten that the originator of the mission of St. Augustine was also the biographer and admirer of St. Benedict, and himself the impersonation of both the monastic and the hierarchical spirit. To that tradition of pagan learning which we have traced, in its decline and disappearance, in the previous chapter, Gregory was even yet more strongly opposed than Jerome, Cassian, or Benedict. Romanity, as a system, was at an end; and in its place monastic mediaeval Christianity had arisen. The powerful intellect which left so deep an impress on the history of the latter half of the sixth century had constructed a new ideal of the Christian life, compared with which that to be found in the pages of Ausonius or Sidonius is languid and feeble indeed. The policy and character of Gregory have been vigorously assailed and ably defended; but, as it seems to us, neither his detractors nor his admirers have assigned sufficient importance to one element in his estimate of human life—an element, however, which really formed the basis of all his calculations.

It is impossible to study the letters of this Father without perceiving that his whole views were dominated by one solemn belief. As firmly as the octogenarian believes that his life is drawing to its close, so firmly did Gregory believe that the world was near its end. The fall of Rome and of the empire were events which pagan and Christian writers had alike foreseen and had equally deprecated, though from different points of view. To the former they seemed to in-

Theories associated with the fall of Rome.

volve the destruction of art, of science, and of learning; in fine, of all that civilization which alone made life worth having. To the latter they portended that final consummation which would bring with it, not simply the overthrow of thrones and empires, but of all earthly things—the anarchy of Antichrist's reign and the Last Judgement. But neither the pagan nor the Christian seer professed to believe that Rome was really 'the Eternal City.' Among the dark traditions most familiar to the former, was that which taught that the twelve vultures seen by her founder from the Palatine symbolised how many centuries the city should endure. Long before, and long after, Rome was actually taken by Alaric, we find, ever recurring at times of great calamity, a disposition on the part of the theologian and the commentator to give a similar precise and definite application to Christian prophecy. The predictions in the Book of Daniel concerning the Fourth Kingdom, the more distinct allusions contained in the apocryphal second book of Esdras, the denunciations of the later Sibylline verses,[1] and the vaguer predictions shadowed forth in the Apocalypse, were all in turn regarded as having a direct relation to present or impending calamity. It was thus that Tertullian was led to pray that the power of Rome might long endure; it was thus that Jerome, in his Bethlehem cell, interpreted, to use Villemain's fine expression, the denunciations of the prophets by the light of burning Rome; it was thus that Sulpicius Severus saw, in the armed strife and struggles for the supreme power that belonged to his own day, the anarchy and woes of 'the last times.' To this theory the great Lombard invasion had given new and terrible emphasis. If a desolated Italy, smoking cities, ruined monasteries, and desecrated temples,—if slaughter, rapine, and social disorganisation such as the empire had never before witnessed,—could be considered as prognosticating the final crisis, then the end was surely at hand. It is observable that Gregory's own adoption of the monastic life seems to have followed closely upon the invasion; and it is certain that throughout

The pagan tradition.

Views of Christian writers.

The invasion of the Lombards.

[1] See Milman, *Hist. of Christianity*, bk. II, c. 7.

CHAP. I.

Gregory's belief that the world was near its end.

the rest of his career he believed that the course of time was all but run: the world's future had dwindled to but a span, and human aims and destinies stood transformed. Of what avail, then, to transcribe the pages of a literature which must shortly perish in one dread conflagration? What folly more suicidal than to expend on the frivolities and errors of paganism those precious hours of which the Judge of all mankind would soon demand so strict an account? To convert the heathen, to succour the helpless and miserable, to study the Scriptures and unfold their latent meaning, to adorn and celebrate the ritual of the Church—these, and these alone, were the occupations which either the crisis could warrant or the conscience sanction!

General acceptance of St. Gregory's teaching in England.

In no country, not even in Italy itself, did Gregory's teaching find more unhesitating acceptance than in England; and it was but natural that it should be so. To the scholars in each monastery and school throughout the land the story of his compassion, as he saw their helpless countrymen standing in the market-place at Rome, must have been a thrice-told tale. It was well known that he had himself started on the mission which he was compelled to delegate to Augustine; and Bede relates at length how all questions that perplexed the latter in his work of conversion were referred for solution to the former.[1] The very music of the English ritual, as modified by Benedict Biscop, on his return from Rome, was associated with Gregory's name. In Gregory's scheme of evangelisation, the city of York had been especially designated as the seat of a northern metropolitan.[2] Of the authority, therefore, of the Gregorian tradition, as the recognised canon of lawful learning in the English monasteries and schools of the seventh and eighth centuries, there can be not the slightest doubt; of its acceptance at the school of York we have, as we have already seen, the direct testimony of Alcuin's biographer; Egbert, the teacher of Alcuin, was the disciple of Bede, to whom, says the writer, he was 'a devoted Samuel;' and 'in Egbert the same learning and doctrine were conspicuous that had shone so brightly in his

Its transmission through the teachers of Alcuin.

[1] *Eccles. Hist.* bk. I, c. 27.

[2] Milman, bk. IV, c. 3.

teachers—in St. Gregory, the Apostle of the Angles;[1] in Gregory's disciple, Augustine; in St. Benedict, and in Cuthbert and Theodorus, *the followers of the first Father and Apostle of the Church in all things.*'[2] Albinus, who preceded Egbert as teacher of the school at York, was Bede's intimate friend, and is expressly named by him in his History as his 'chief guide and helper' in the compilation of the work.

Antagonism of this teaching to the eastern Church.

In the above significant reference to the teaching of these eminent men, as maintaining *the Petrine tradition*, we see brought before us another and scarcely less important feature in the doctrine handed down from Gregory—namely, *the spirit of antagonism to the eastern Church.* Admitting, as we needs must, the wide differences that distinguish the western Church of the seventh century from that of the thirteenth—the ecclesiasticism of Gregory from that of Innocent III—it is still not difficult to trace back to the former some at least of the elements of the dispute which developed into the great schism. Even Gregory's indignant repudiation of the title of 'universal bishop'—a disavowal often quoted to shew the indefensible character of the pretensions of his successors in the papal chair—was called forth, it is to be remembered, not by any abstract proposition respecting such a supremacy, but by the assumption of the title by his rival at Constantinople. 'His very protest,' it has been said, 'was a link in the chain which was to hold the Latin nations together and to fasten them to the chair of the successor of St. Peter.'[3] It is certain that to this period we can trace back much of that jealousy of eastern ritual and

[1] 'The Apostle of the Angles;' compare Bede's language, 'for we may and ought rightly to call him our Apostle.' *Eccles. Hist.* bk. II, c. 1.

[2] '. . . in quo (Egbert) ea, suis quae in praeceptoribus fulserat doctrina non mediocriter enituit, in sancto videlicet Anglorum apostolo Gregorio, Augustino ejus discipulo, Benedicto sancto, Cuthbertoque simul et Theodoro, primi Patris et apostoli per omnia . . . sequentibus.' Migne, ci 94. Wilfrid, bishop of York, seems to have unlearned at Rome whatever he might have learned at Lindisfarne of an opposite character; and Theodorus, Greek though he was by birth, appears throughout as the staunch assertor of the Roman discipline, though not of papal jurisdiction. See Bede, *Ecc. Hist.* bk. III, c. 29; bk. IV, c. 2; bk. V, c. 19.

[3] Maurice, *Philosophy of the First Six Centuries*, p. 155.

CHAP. I.

eastern tenets which ultimately resulted in the formal separation of the two Churches.

Differences between British and Latin Christianity.

Unlike the representatives of Teutonism in Italy, Spain, and Gaul, at the same period, the Saxons, Angles, and Frisians who invaded Britain in the fifth century were completely ignorant of Christianity, and no influence among the race whom they subjugated, expelled, or exterminated, appears to have pleaded in behalf of that faith which was still cherished as a tradition from the Roman occupation. No British ecclesiastic saw, like St. Remy, another Clovis bending in adoration before the uplifted cross; no Clotilda, among the conquerors of Cantia or East Anglia, moulded the stern spirit of her pagan lord by tales of miraculous powers wielded by the apostles of the Latin faith. Christianity fled with its British adherents to the mountain fastnesses of Wales, to the Gaelic borders in the north, or to where, within the tranquil precincts of the Holy Isle, flourishing and wealthy monasteries still afforded shelter to learning and religion. Between these poor fugitives and the Church of Rome the Saxon-occupation interposed a barrier that resulted in complete isolation. Any attempt to convert the Saxon conqueror must have appeared hopeless, and across the hostile populations of Mercia, Wessex, East Anglia, and Cantia, they could not stretch the hand of brotherhood to Rome. Between this Church and that of Rome elements of serious difference accordingly grew silently up. The latter Church, with the view of bringing its reckoning of Easter into harmony with that of the still powerful and flourishing communion at Alexandria, decided, in the year 458, to substitute for the older 84-year cycle that of 532 years,[1] known as the 19-years' cycle, introduced in A.D. 457 by Victor of Aquitaine. In the year 525, this reckoning was in turn modified by the method introduced by Dionysius

Controversy concerning Easter.

[1] Obtained by multiplying together 19, the cycle of the moon, and 28, the cycle of the sun. See an able summary of the whole question of the observance of Easter in an article by the Rev. L. Hensley, in Smith and Cheetham's *Dict. of Christian Antiquities*, vol. i. That the Irish method was not derived from the Eastern Church is clearly shewn in Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils and Documents*, I, c. ii, Append. n.

Exiguus. Another element of difference was that of the right mode of performing baptism; but after the time of Augustine, the controversy turned mainly upon the mode of calculating Easter and the fashion of the tonsure. Other points of difference are recorded: the British Church had a peculiar ritual in the mass and at ordination; and it is worthy of note that the consecration of a bishop by a *single bishop* was regarded as valid—a view to which the Romish Church long afterwards gave its sanction.[1]

Other points of difference.

It was thus that, when the British clergy and the monks who accompanied Augustine were brought face to face, it was found that a formidable if not insurmountable element of difference existed. In connexion with this somewhat obscure passage in our history, it is but just to remember that Bede, from whom we derive our knowledge of the facts, was entirely on the side of the Latin Church; and it at least admits of doubt whether that 'obstinate and indiscriminating isolation,' for which the British clergy have been censured by a high authority,[2] was not rather the result of a well-warranted conviction that there was little hope of their being admitted to treat on equal terms with those who were supported by the conqueror. But, however we may be inclined to apportion the blame, it is certain that about the time of Theodorus, who was consecrated seventh archbishop of Canterbury in the year 668, the Roman—that is to say, the Gregorian—traditions of Church discipline entirely supplanted those of the British Church. Wilfrid, afterwards archbishop of York, unlearned at Rome the Celtic traditions of Lindisfarne, and at the memorable council of Whitby, in 664, maintained the tradition of St. Peter; Colman, the bishop of Lindisfarne, maintained, on the other hand, the tradition of St. John. It is a familiar story how he nevertheless admitted that St. Peter held the keys of heaven; whereupon Oswin, the conqueror of the pagan Penda, declared himself on the side of the latter apostle—'lest, when

The Roman doctrine supplants that of the British Church.

[1] Bede, *Eccles. Hist.* IV i; V xxi.

[2] 'There was no reason why the English should not have become Christian when and as the Franks did, but from the condition and temper of the native population.' Stubbs, *Const. Hist.* i 220.

CHAP. I.

Bede's sympathy with the former.

I offer myself at the gates of heaven, he should shut them against me.' From this time the Petrine, the Gregorian, the Roman tradition was supreme. The 'Scots,' by which name Bede denotes the Celtic clergy, either yielded submission or 'returned into their own country.'[1] He himself, educated in the orthodox doctrine, recorded their defeat, and insensibly imbibed that feeling of strong partisanship which, combined with his Anglo-Saxon sympathies, has left a marked impress on his writings. A native clergy grew up who were, as Milman describes them, 'the admiring pupils of the Roman clergy;' who looked ever to Rome for guidance in doubt or difficulty. To visit Rome became the crowning ambition of both the monastic and the priestly life.[2] When we consider that Egbert, the teacher of the school of York, was largely guided by the counsels of Bede, and that he, along with his kinsman Elbert, was the instructor of Alcuin, we shall have sufficiently explained the general character of the traditions that Alcuin inherited and was likely to transmit. His unqualified admiration for Gregory is, indeed, conspicuous throughout his writings.[3]

Bede's mental characteristics.

Of Bede, Egbert, Elbert, and Alcuin it may alike be said, that they all appear to have exhibited with singular uniformity the main characteristics of the Anglo-Saxon mind. Of this the first is perhaps the most striking example. The ability with which he digested the stores of learning that Theodorus, Benedict Biscop, Albinus, and Northelm successively imported from the Continent, must not lead us into the error of attributing to him the possession of original genius. The exuberant fancy with which, after the manner of Cassian and Ambrose, he interprets the Pentateuch and

[1] *Eccles. Hist.* III xviii. Milman, ii 249.

[2] It will be observed that this deference to the *doctrinal* teaching of Rome stood on quite another basis from that on which it was sought to found the claims of *papal supremacy* in England. Wilfrid's endeavours to assert the latter were successfully resisted by Theodorus and the Northumbrian monarch. See an important criticism on this passage in English Church history in Haddan's *Remains*, pp. 208–9, 323.

[3] 'Gregorius . . . toto venerabilis orbi,' 'maximus agrorum Christi cultor;' Alcuin ranks him with St. Jerome, 'Ecclesiae ille pater, iste magister erat.' Migne, ci 742, 816.

the Book of Samuel is essentially the activity of a second-rate order of intellect. As it was, however, his powers were exactly of the kind which enabled him to render very effective service to his age. He appreciated, classified, and interpreted the newly discovered literature in a manner in harmony with the traditions of the Latin Church. He advocated no counter-theory, raised no controversy, founded no school: it was all that at the time his countrymen needed at his hands. But whether a simple adherence to the same canons was sufficient to maintain a vigorous life in the school at York, or in any other school, is a question which Alcuin's career and experiences will bring very prominently before us.

Alcuin's agreement with Bede.

As a theologian, Alcuin, like Bede, is little more than an echo of preceding writers. In the eminently characteristic letter to two Frankish ladies, prefixed to his commentary on St. John's Gospel, he confesses, indeed, very candidly that he claims no higher function. As the physician compounds his medicines from herbs gathered from various fields, so he himself is but a gleaner in the writings of the great doctors of the Church—St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, St. Gregory, and Bede.[1] He levies, in fact, such heavy contributions on the Homilies of the last-named writer, that Mabillon called in question his right to be considered the author of the commentary in question; and the doubt thus raised was decided in Alcuin's favour only when Frobenius pointed out the allusions to the Adoptionists, of whom Bede, of course, could have known nothing.[2]

Harmony between his ecclesiastical views and the Carolingian policy.

But although as a theologian Alcuin held but an inferior position, his views as a churchman possessed this signal merit, that they were in complete harmony with the Carolingian policy. In all questions of authority, his deference for Rome exceeds even that of Bede or any preceding English ecclesiastic. As Pepin-le-Bref, by his grants of territory,

[1] Migne, c 741.

[2] *Ibid.* c 736. Frobenius, however, adds, 'Alcuinus tamen omnes Ven. Bedae homilias, in quibus nonnulla capitula S. Joannis exposuit, in suum commentarium transtulit.'

CHAP. I.

had laid the foundations of the temporal power, so Alcuin supported the papal supremacy by citations from those apocryphal fragments which were afterwards to appear in the Pseudo-Isidore;[1] and as Charles the Great declared himself to be 'in all things the ally of the apostolic see,'[2] so Alcuin taught that a good Catholic must bow to the approved authority of the Holy Roman Church.[3] The hierarchical views that prevailed at York were completely consonant with the political views that obtained at Aachen. Emperor and scholar were, each in his way, carrying out the ideas of Gregory the Great; and it is not improbable that Alcuin's influence may have contributed (perhaps more materially than has ever been suspected) to what some have regarded as Charles' 'chief political error'[4]—the encouragement which he afforded to the pretensions of Rome.

The library at York.

Most students of English history are familiar with the lines in which Alcuin enthusiastically describes the library of which he was the appointed guardian at York,[5] and from

[1] 'Memini me legisse quondam, si rite recordor, in canonibus beati Silvestri, non minus 72 testibus pontificem accusandum esse, et judicio praesentari: et ut illorum talis vita esset, ut contra talem auctoritatem potuissent stare. Insuper et in aliis legebam canonibus, apostolicam sedem judiciarium esse, non judicandum.' *Epist. to Arno*, Migne, c 324.

[2] '... adjutor in omnibus apostolicae sedis.' Capitulary of 769. Pertz, *Legg.* i 33.

[3] 'Et ne schismaticus inveniatur et non catholicus, sequatur probatissimam sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae auctoritatem.' Migne, c 293. See also *Adv. Felicem*, I 6, and VII 13.

[4] Hallam, *Middle Ages*, i 13.

[5] 'Illic invenies veterum vestigia Patrum,
Quidquid habet pro se Latio Romanus in orbe,
Graecia vel quidquid transmisit clara Latinis:
Hebraicus vel quod populus bibit imbre superno,
Africa lucifluo vel quidquid lumine sparsit.
Quod Pater Hieronymus, quod sensit Hilarius, atque
Ambrosius, praesul, simul Augustinus, et ipse
Sanctus Athanasius, quod Orosius edit avitus:
Quidquid Gregorius summus docet, et Leo papa;
Basilius quidquid, Fulgentius atque coruscant.
Cassiodorus item, Chrysostomus atque Joannes.
Quidquid et Altbelmus docuit, quid Beda magister
Quae Victorinus scripsere, Boetius: atque
Historici veteres, Pompeius, Plinius, ipse
Acer Aristoteles, rhetor quoque Tullius ingens.

whence we shall gain our most accurate idea of the extent and character of the learning which he was now to convey to the monasteries and schools of Frankland. The imposing enumeration at once calls our attention to the fact that the library at York, at this period, far surpassed any possessed by either England or France in the twelfth century, whether that of Christ Church, Canterbury, of St. Victor at Paris, or of Bec in Normandy. The invasions of the Northmen in the ninth and tenth centuries fell, in both countries, with peculiar severity on the monasteries; and the result was that neither Alfred the Great, St. Dunstan, nor John of Salisbury had access to libraries like those known to Bede and Alcuin.

The authors studied by Alcuin.

Allowing for the poetic vein of Alcuin's description, and not unreasonably surmising (although he assures us the list might have been greatly extended) that an enumeration which includes the names of Phocas (the author of a sorry life of Virgil), of Euticius, and Comminianus, can hardly have passed by much of note or value, it is still probable that the library was the best that England then possessed.

Boethius, *b.* 470; *d.* 524.

With two exceptions, to one of which we shall have hereafter to allude at length,[1] all the text-books of the period are there. Of these Boethius must certainly be regarded as the most important, from the fact that in his pages are preserved that slight modicum of school learning which found

Quid quoque Sedulius, vel quid canit ipse Juvencus,
Alcinius (?) et Clemens, Prosper, Paulinus, Arator,
Quid Fortunatus, vel quid Lactantius edunt.
Quod Maro Virgilius, Statius, Lucanus et Auctor:
Artis grammaticae vel quid scripsere magistri;
Quid Probus atque Phocas, Donatus, Priscianusve,
Servius, Euticius, Pompeius, Comminianus.
Invenies alios perplures, lector, ibidem
Egregios studiis, arte et sermone magistros,
Plurima qui claro scripsere volumina sensu:
Nomina sed quorum praesenti in carmine scribi
Longius est visum quam plectri postulet usus.'

Poema de Pont. Eccles. Eboracensis, 1535–1603. Migne, ci 843–4.

[1] The other author is Isidorus, omitted probably on account of the metrical difficulty, for we have evidence that his writings were well known to Alcuin.

CHAP. I.

its way into the education of the time. His adaptation of the Arithmetic of Nicomachus; his treatise on music; his translation, with some trifling additions, of the first four books of Euclid; and his version of portions of Aristotle's *Organon*, must be looked upon as forming the basis of the highest education then known. Unfortunately his writings shared in the fate that overtook so many of the chief lights of Latin literature. Of his translation of the Organon the more important part, including the Prior and Posterior Analytics, the *Topica* and the *Sophistici Elenchi*, seems to have been lost to learning soon after his death, and was not recovered until the twelfth century. The Categories themselves disappeared from sight for some centuries, their place being supplied by a meagre Latin abridgement, falsely attributed to St. Augustine of Hippo. The *De Interpretatione* accordingly alone remained, and this, together with a translation of the Isagoge of Porphyry by Boethius, and some of Boethius' own logical treatises, must be considered to have made up the sum of the Aristotelian logic known to the age of Alcuin.[1] How entirely ignorant that age was of Aristotle's ethical, metaphysical, and scientific treatises it is unnecessary here to explain; but the foregoing comments will suffice to shew that when Alcuin affirms of the library at York that it contained

Portions of his translations of Aristotle known to Alcuin.

> Quae . . . scripsere Boetius . . . ipse
> Acer Aristoteles,

his statement must be accepted with very important limitations.

[1] For the evidence at greater length see my *History of the University of Cambridge*, pp. 27–29; it will be sufficient here to quote the summary of this important question given by Prantl: 'Kurz also—um die Abgränzung so entschieden und deutlich als möglich zu wiederholen—*es besteht für diesen ersten Abschnitt des Mittelalters das traditionelle Material der Logik ausschliesslich aus Folgendem:* Mart. Capella, Augustin, Pseudo-Augustin, Cassiodorus, Boethius ad Porphyrium a Vict. transl., ad Porph. a se transl., ad Arist. Categ.; ad Arist. De Interpretatione (ed. 1 and 2), ad Ciceronis Topica, Introd. ad Cat. Syll., D. Syll. Cat., D. Syll. Hyp., De Div., D. Defin., D. Diff. Top. Hingegen fehlt die Kenntniss der beiden Analytiken, der Topik, und der *Sophistici Elenchi* des Aristotles.' Prantl, ii 4. See also some observations by M. Hauréau, i 94; also *Recherches Critiques sur l'Age et l'Origine des Traductions Latines d'Aristote, par M. A. Jourdain.* 1843.

CHAP. I.

The *De Artibus et Disciplinis liberabilium litterarum* of Cassiodorus, whom Alcuin also names, must appear, when compared with Boethius, a singularly meagre production. The four subjects of the *quadrivium*—arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy—are each dismissed in two pages; those of the *trivium* are somewhat more fully explained, but not a spark of originality relieves the treatise. Prantl animadverts upon the confusion, shewn in the discussion of the τόποι, of those which belong to rhetoric and those proper to dialectic.[1] Nevertheless it is to this writer that, up to the thirteenth century, students in the Middle Ages were indebted for their knowledge of the Topics; for in Martianus Capella nothing is to be found on this division of logic, and Isidorus, who gives the dialectical τόποι, appears to have been indebted for them to the undiscerning industry of his predecessor.[2] With this latter writer we have ample evidence that Alcuin was well acquainted, though a metrical difficulty appears to have excluded the name from his enumeration of authors. Isidorus was a Spanish bishop of the seventh century; and his treatise, entitled *Originum seu Etymologiarum libri xx*, was perhaps the most popular of all compendiums of school knowledge at this time. His attainments obtained for him in his own day the reputation of being the most learned man of his age. Alcuin himself styles him *lumen Hispaniae*, and cites him as an authority among the doctors of the Church; but we can have no more convincing proof of the darkness that reigned in the kingdom of the Visigoths, notwithstanding the immunity that Spain then enjoyed from political commotion, than the fact that the *Origines* of Isidorus represents its maximum of light. The work is a kind of encyclopaedia, in 20 books, of such information as still survived in connexion with every subject, whether literature, science, or religion. In astronomy his attainments enabled him to state that the sun

Cassiodorus, *b.* 468; *d.* 568.

Isidorus, *b.* 570; *d.* 636.

[1] I give this statement on the authority of Prantl; otherwise it is well known that Aristotle himself considered his Rhetoric to be closely connected with the Topics (Rhet. II, last chapter). Blakesley, *Life of Aristotle*, p. 144. Cassiodorus appears to have confounded the distinctive elements of the two subjects.

[2] Prantl, i 724.

CHAP. I.

was bigger than either the moon or the earth; but he appears to have known but little more, and the illustration may serve to shew the extreme vagueness of his scientific knowledge. In logic he would seem to have derived his information almost entirely from Cassiodorus, much as Cassiodorus had derived his from Boethius.

Martianus Capella (fl. c. 424) unmentioned.

There was yet another text-book which, notwithstanding the completeness of the library at York, does not occur in Alcuin's enumeration; nor can we regard the omission as accidental, for the book was one which there is good reason for supposing he would never have placed in the hands of his pupils. Among the most popular writers of the fifth century was Martianus Capella,[1] a native of Carthage, and a teacher of rhetoric in the schools of that city at a time when their reputation was at its highest. Martianus was fully acquainted with the Christian tenets, but, unlike his fellow professors, Arnobius and Orosius, he appears to have inclined to an eclecticism borrowed from the yet more famous schools of Alexandria, of that kind with which the names of Philo Judaeus, Clemens, and Origen are associated—the Platonic philosophy in attempted harmony with Christian doctrine.

His allegorical treatment of his subject.

It was not to his philosophic teaching, however, that Martianus was indebted for his wide-spread and enduring popularity. His lively African fancy had suggested to him the idea of embodying the course of the *trivium* and *quadrivium* in an allegorical dress; he is, in fact, a rival claimant with Augustine for the honour of having first invented that time-honoured division of the sciences. The first two books of Martianus are, accordingly, entirely occupied with a fantastic story of the marriage of Mercury and Philologia, or, in more modern phrase, of science and eloquence. Jupiter, warned by the oracles, convenes a meeting of the gods, and demands the rights of naturalisation for one hitherto but a mortal virgin. Mercury then assigns to his

[1] '*Martiani Minaei Felicis Capellae Carthaginiensis Viri Proconsularis Satyricon, in quo de Nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii libri duo, et de Septem Artibus liberalibus libri singulares*,' ed. Eyssenhardt, Lipsiae, 1866; ed. Kopp and Hermann, Frankfort, 1836.

CHAP. I.

bride seven virgins as her attendants, each of whom is in turn introduced at the marriage banquet, and descants on that particular branch of knowledge denoted by her name. The humour with which the allegory is relieved is broad, and occasionally coarse; but it hit the fancy of the age. In fact, although we may question the right of Martianus to be regarded as the inventor of the *trivium* and *quadrivium*, there is every probability that it was mainly owing to his fanciful conception that they were so faithfully preserved in the traditions of mediaeval education, while the idea is supposed to have suggested the allegory contained in a far better known treatise, the *De Consolatione* of Boethius. Wherever pious scruples did not prevent, the work became the favourite text-book of the schools; Gregory of Tours frankly admits, that whatever of the arts or sciences was to be known in his day was to be found in Martianus Capella;[1] it was translated into German so early as the eleventh century;[2] it is often cited even by so late and discerning a writer as John of Salisbury.

Influence attributed to his example.

Neither the allegory nor the science contained in the pages of the *De Nuptiis* would have led to the suppression of the volume on the part of the teachers at York; but Martianus also ventured to employ his fancy within the domain of religious belief. Of the two Platonic dialogues known to mediaeval scholars,[3] the Timaeus, as preserved in the translation of Chalcidius, offered powerful temptation to the speculative mind; but the divine of the eighth century could tolerate no scientific theorisation that contravened that of the inspired volume, and the cosmogony of the Timaeus could not be reconciled with that of the Mosaic

Speculative character of the treatise.

[1] 'Quod si te, sacerdos Dei, quicumque es, *Martianus noster* septem disciplinis erudiit, id est, si te in grammaticis docuit legere, in dialecticis altercationum propositiones advertere, in rhetoricis genera metrorum agnoscere, in geometricis terrarum linearumque mensuras colligere, in astrologicis cursus siderum contemplari, in arithmeticis numerorum partes colligere, in harmoniis sonorum modulationes suavium accentuum carminibus concrepare.' Greg. Turon. x 31.

[2] Wackernagel (*Altdeutsches Lesebuch*, p. 150) gives considerable fragments of this version.

[3] The other was the *Phaedo*.

CHAP. I.

narrative. When accordingly, on turning the pages of Martianus, the faithful followers of St. Gregory and his doctrine read of a great sphere occupying the centre of the heavens, the Platonic ἰδέα of the world—of a race of beings permitted for a time to assume the human form, to mingle with man and to console humanity, returning afterwards to their celestial abodes—of 'three gods' to whom the writer professed to pay special worship, but whom he apparently regarded as simply more powerful or propitious than other and pagan divinities—their feelings were much the same as those of a Christian educator of youth in the present day, who might discover lurking in the pages of an elementary treatise on natural philosophy the most advanced conclusions of modern materialism.[1]

Mistrust with which it was consequently regarded by the teachers at York.

Nor can it be any matter for surprise that the teachers at York were keenly alive to the risks attendant upon teaching of such a character. Christianity was still a tender plant in England, in some parts of very recent growth. Bede, in his boyhood, must often have heard how pagan sacrifice was still offered upon the altars of Sussex. It was natural that he and his successors should prefer to give their sanction to authors calculated rather to confirm faith than encourage speculation. So far, therefore, from its being simply fortuitous, there seems to be good reason for regarding it as a fact of considerable significance, that throughout the writings of Alcuin we find no mention of the treatise of Martianus Capella; that the book is similarly absent in a catalogue of the library at St. Riquier in the ninth century[2]—a monastery of which Angilbert, Alcuin's

Their apprehensions not altogether without reason.

[1] It is, however, but just to recognise the fact that Capella's speculative tendencies are supposed to have furnished the hint which directed Copernicus to the discovery of his system. In his eighth chapter he points out that Mercury and Venus revolve *not round the earth but round the sun*. Delambre observes that, if this observation really resulted in so eminent a service to science, 'nous devons lui pardonner son verbiage, ses bévues et son galimathias.' See edition by Kopp, p. 856.

[2] A library, it is to be noted, of 250 volumes. (See *Spicilegium Acherii*, ii 311.) On the appearance of this author in catalogues of the eleventh and twelfth centuries no stress can be laid, as he had, by that time, become accepted as a classic, and the guardians of orthodoxy found their attention

pupil, was abbat; while its presence, along with the works of Origen, in the catalogue of the library of the monastery at Bobbio, at the same period, a foundation of St. Columban, and one maintaining the tradition of his teaching, may be looked upon as subsidiary evidence of an ascertained fact, that a different school of thought was there recognised and encouraged.

The absence and presence of the treatise alike significant.

In thus endeavouring concisely to point out the distinctive characteristics of the school treatises which Alcuin carried with him across the Channel, our task has been one of something more than merely antiquarian interest. As text-books of instruction, it is true, Martianus, Boethius, Cassiodorus, and Isidorus have, for the last six centuries, been altogether discarded, but their influence has lasted to the present day; and the critic and historian who should affect to consider the theories shadowed forth in these writers, and the speculative or conservative tendencies respectively discernible, as unworthy of serious discussion, would scarcely be wiser than the naturalist who should think it trivial to regard the scarcely perceptible differences that sometimes distinguish the seed of a poisonous or useless plant from that of one eminently serviceable to man.

Influence of the foregoing text-books on subsequent learning.

At the time that Alcuin made good his promise given to Charles at Parma he was in his forty-eighth year, the monarch in his forty-first. That the reception accorded to the former at Aachen was in every way calculated to inspire him with confidence and hope admits of no doubt. Charles was distinguished by the favour with which he regarded guests from other lands. 'Amabat peregrinos,' says Einhard; who indeed adds, that the number of these at court often formed an appreciable addition to the demands on the royal revenues.[1] The attraction was, however, of a very different kind from that which drew the pleasure-loving Aquitanians to the court of Robert Capet; and the encouragement bestowed equally dissimilar from that extended by Henry III or

Favour with which Charles regarded foreigners.

called away to other and more formidable symptoms of heterodox teaching.

[1] *Vita Caroli*, c. xxi; *Carolina*, p. 528.

CHAP. I.

Edward II to the Poitevin and Anjevin of their day. It was the sympathy of a truly imperial nature, singularly intolerant of narrow traditions and local prejudices, and keenly alive to the advantages to be derived from intercourse with minds formed under other conditions and reflecting the results of different experiences. The supposition of one of Alcuin's biographers, that the new teacher arrived at a juncture when cessation from warfare enabled Charles to give less distracted attention to the promotion of learning, seems to be scarcely in harmony with the facts. In the very same year the Saxons broke out into formidable insurrection,[1] and upwards of four thousand prisoners were massacred by the incensed monarch on the banks of the Aller; while for more than four years after his arrival, Alcuin must have been constantly hearing of sanguinary conflicts on the Weser and the Elbe. Though far more nearly allied to the pagan foe than to the Frank by race, we should hardly expect to find him much moved at the sufferings and gradual subjugation of the former. The instincts of the churchman were paramount, and Witikind seemed to him only another Penda; but though he regarded the conversion of these stubborn Saxons at the point of the sword as well-nigh an indispensable process, it is evident that he would gladly have seen the vigorous policy of the subjugator combined with something more of mercy.[2]

Distractions of the time.

The Saxon war.

It is a striking illustration of Charles' immense energy and activity, that amid distractions like these he yet found time to welcome his new instructor, and to aid him in imparting fresh life to the Palatine school. Whether, as some writers have maintained, this famous school dates as far back as the time of Pepin-le-Bref, or even to that of the Merovingian dynasty, is a question into which it scarcely seems necessary here to enter.[3] The testimony of the monk of Angoulême that, before the time of Charles, 'there

Question of the previous existence of the Palace

[1] *Vita Caroli*, c. 7. *Carolina*, p. 515.

[2] Migne, c 142, 362.

[3] See, on this point, Pitra, *Hist. de S. Léger*, cc. 2 and 3: also passages quoted in favour of the hypothesis by Ozanam, pp. 462-3. Also Léon Maitre, p. 34; Monnier, pp. 62-3.

existed in Gaul scarcely a trace of the liberal arts'—Charles' own explicit declaration that 'the study of letters had been well-nigh extinguished by the neglect of his ancestors'[1]—and the account given by Einhard of the sources from which the monarch himself acquired whatever learning he possessed—certainly lend no countenance to such an hypothesis. As little do we find, to support the theory of a kind of Athenaeum or Academy, composed of the adult members of Charles' court—'le rendez-vous des courtisans, des conseillers, et des savants.'[2] The narrow limits of the studies of the time, a range so limited that a Martianus or Isidorus seemed a sufficient compendium of knowledge, rather make it probable that an intelligent youth of 16 or 17, receiving that training which Charles himself had *not* received in his early years, must soon have stood on a level with the best scholars in the royal court—Einhard, perhaps, alone excepted. For our present purpose it is sufficient to be able safely to conclude, that Charles regarded the restoration of letters in his empire as a work only second in importance to the maintenance of the empire itself—that with this view he assembled round him the noble youth of his court, destined to high office and Church preferment, to form the Palace School—that this school accompanied him wherever he fixed his court—that he obtained for it the instruction of the ablest teacher of the age—and that, whenever the affairs of state and cessation from military operations permitted (which was chiefly in the winter time), he himself was wont, along with the more intelligent of his courtiers, to take his seat in the midst of the learners, stimulating their ardour by his example, and gratifying his own thirst for knowledge by discussion and enquiry. In the manner in which he thus brought his personal influence to bear on the movement, we recognise one all-important fact—*the Palace School witnessed the first considerable innovation on the Gregorian tradition.* Had Alcuin, on his first arrival, been placed at the head of the monastery at Tours, his instruction there, it is easy to

Innovation on the Gregorian tradition.

[1] *Constitutio de emendatione Librorum*, etc. Baluze, i 204-5.

[2] Léon Maitre, p. 32.

CHAP. I.

Character of its members.

Practical nature of Charles' designs.

Charles' own acquirements.

see, would have been confined within far narrower limits. But the circle which he found himself called upon to instruct at Charles' court craved for something more than to learn to chant, read Latin, and calculate the return of Easter. Ecclesiastics or lords of monasteries though some of them might be, they were also statesmen, courtiers, and men of the world. Palgrave has justly observed that in thus patronising learning Charles' purpose was quite as much to benefit the state as dictated by any abstract appreciation of the value of mental culture; the Greek professorships, for example, which he sought to establish at Osnaburg and Salzburg, were designed for the practical end of facilitating intercourse with the eastern empire.[1] With respect to his own acquirements, the circumstances of his early life, the character of his genius, and the explicit testimony of his biographer, alike point to the conclusion that they represented the results of an unusually quick perception and retentive memory rather than of laborious application and early training. His knowledge of the colloquial Latin of the age was equal to that of his native German. He appears to have understood Greek, though he spoke it very imperfectly. His natural facility of expression was such that, as Einhard admits, his discourse sometimes bordered on loquacity.[2] He had acquired when young some knowledge of grammar from Peter of Pisa, but whatever he knew of rhetoric, logic, or arithmetic he was yet to gain from the teaching of Alcuin.[3] He aspired to master the art of penmanship; but, says his biographer, his efforts in this respect, 'commenced too late in life, were attended with little success;'[4] nor is it difficult to

[1] *Hist. of England and Normandy*, i 27–8. Baluze, i 418. Charles' scheme never came to successful accomplishment.

[2] 'Adeo quidem facundus erat, ut etiam dicaculus apparerat.' *Caroli Vita*, c. 25; *Carolina*, p. 531. 'Dicaculus' is the reading accepted by Dümmler, and we can hardly doubt that this, and not 'didasculus,' is the right one.

[3] 'In discenda grammatica Petrum Pisanum, diaconum, senem audivit in caeteris discipliuis Albinum, cognomento Alcoinum, item diaconum de Britannia, Saxonici generis hominem . . . praeceptorem habuit.' *Ibid.*

[4] 'Sed parum successit labor praeposterus ac sero inchoatus.' *Ibid.* The attempt made by some writers (see Einhard, ed. Teulet, i 83) to shew that

understand that the royal hand, stiffened with oft-wielding of the good sword 'Joyeuse,' may have refused to accommodate itself to the most painful and laborious of all the acquirements of an ordinary education.

Conditions under which Alcuin's instructions were imparted.

The regular education of the youth of the Palace School was derived from the manuals of which we have given an account, and, as regarded extent and variety, was probably a simple reproduction of that which Alcuin had himself received at York. Of all living scholars, he was the least likely to introduce innovations upon the traditional curriculum. When, however, the circle was joined by Charles and the older members of his court, the instruction necessarily assumed a different form. The adult mind can rarely master knowledge after the fashion of more tender years. That wondrous faculty of the youthful intellect which causes it to resemble a capacious carpet bag, in the way in which it receives and retains whatever the instructor may think fit to put into it, disappears as the judgement becomes matured. The memory then refuses to burden itself with facts of which it apprehends neither the importance nor the connexion; and so we find Charles and his courtiers plying the *vates* from across the Channel with innumerable questions, often blundering strangely and misapprehending widely, but forming a circle which even at this lapse of time it is impossible to contemplate without interest:—the monarch himself, in the ardour of a long unsatisfied curiosity, propounding queries on all imaginable topics—suggesting, distinguishing, disputing, objecting,—a colossal figure, gazing fixedly with bright blue eyes on his admired guest, and altogether a presence that might well have disconcerted a less assured intellect. Alcuin, however, holding fast by his

Members of the circle.

Charles and his sons.

reference is here intended only to the art of calligraphy as practised at the monasteries, will scarcely commend itself to the dispassionate critic. Einhard would never have been content to designate such an accomplishment by the single word 'scribere;' nor again, if Charles had once acquired the art of writing, would he have found it difficult to improve his command of it. Some lines quoted by Léon Maitre, even if accepted as authoritative, would fail to prove that the corrections of the MS. referred to were made by Charles' own hand.

CHAP. I.

Boethius, Cassiodorus, and Isidorus, is calm and self-possessed; feeling assured that, so long as he only teaches what 'Gregorius summus' and 'Baeda venerabilis' believed and taught, he cannot go very far wrong. Around him, as the years went by, he saw successively appear the three royal sons, born in rightful wedlock: Charles, the future ruler of Neustria and Austrasia; Pepin, the acknowledged lord of Italy; and Lewis, who almost from his cradle had worn the crown of Aquitaine—the graceful young athlete and mighty hunter, his mind already opening to that love for learning which, through all the good and evil of his chequered life, he cherished so fondly in later years. There, again, was Charles' much loved sister, Gisela, abbess of Chelles, who from her girlhood had renounced the world, but whom the fame of the great teacher drew from her conventual retirement. Thither also came the last and best-loved of Charles' wives, Liutgarda, of the proud Alemannic race, hereafter to prove among the firmest of Alcuin's friends; and the royal daughter, Gisela, whom parental affection held too dear for the proudest alliance. There too was Charles' son-in-law Angilbert, chiefly distinguished as yet by his fondness for the histrionic art, but afterwards the saintly abbat of St. Riquier. There too were the royal cousins, the half-brothers, Adelhard and Wala, whose after action shook the whole fabric of the Carolingian empire—the former brought back from Corbey to mingle again with the court life which he had shunned, and to forget Desiderata's wrongs—the latter, whose fair face bespoke his Saxon lineage, restored from a mysterious banishment to the royal favour. There too were Riculfus, destined ere long to fill the chair of St. Boniface and rule the great see of Mayence; Einhard, the royal biographer, the classic of the ninth century; and Fredegis, Alcuin's youthful countryman, poet and philosopher, not always faithful to his master's teaching.

His sister.

His wife, Liutgarda.

His daughter.

Angilbert.

Adelhard and Wala.

Riculfus.

Einhard.

Fredegis.

Names assumed by members of the Palace School.

It appears to have been a frequent affectation, in mediaeval times, for distinguished men to assume a literary or historic *alias*;[1] and to this custom we must attribute the fact that

[1] Palgrave, i 277. 'Saepe familiaritas nominis immutationem solet facere, sicut ipse Dominus Simonem mutavit in Petrum,' is Alcuin's own observation on the practice. *Epist.* 125; Migne, c 361.

CHAP. I.

Alcuin usually, in his correspondence, addresses the members of this circle under another name. Charles' second name would seem to have really been David;[1] and this fact may account for the assumption of Scriptural names by some of his courtiers. Pepin was Julius; Gisela (the sister), Lucia; Gisela (the daughter), Delia; Liutgarda was Ava; Adelhard was Antony; Wala, Arsenius;[2] Einhard, with reference, as M. Teulet conjectures, to his destined state avocation, was Beseleel; Riculfus, Flavius Damoetas; Rigbod, Machairas; Angilbert, Homer; Fredegis, Nathanael.

Alcuin's admiration of Charles.

For the most part, it is evident that Alcuin regarded with genuine admiration the intense and untiring energy of the royal intellect;[3] he averred, indeed, that were his subjects like him, all Frankland would become a second Athens. Sometimes, however, he found it necessary to suggest to the victorious warrior that the domain of knowledge, unlike the wide realm over which the latter ruled, could never become an autocracy. Charles occasionally indulged in expressions which seemed to betray a contrary notion—an idea that an immortal genius might be made to appear at his behest, much as a new province had often been added to his empire by the sword. 'Why,' he exclaimed on one occasion, 'why have I not twelve of my clergy as learned as Jerome or Augustine?' The devout ecclesiastic was scandalised at such immoderation of desire. 'The Lord of heaven and earth,' he rejoined, 'has but two such, and thou wouldst have twelve!'

His post a laborious one.

That Alcuin's duties were both trying and onerous can hardly be doubted, embracing as they did the instruction of the monarch, the courtier, and the youthful members of the

[1] Palgrave, i 149. If this were the case, we may safely assume that the name had been bestowed upon him in the sense in which it is erroneously explained by Isidorus—'fortis manu, quia fortissimus in praeliis fuit' (*Etymologiae*, bk. viii)—rather than from a knowledge of the meaning of the Hebrew.

[2] The same name, it is to be noted, that is given to Wala in the singular contemporary sketch of his political career discovered by Mabillon. See *Epitaphium Arsenii*, by Paschasius Radbertus. Palgrave, i 275–7; Alcuin, *Epist.* 125; Migne, c 361.

[3] 'Cujus mentis miranda est nobilitas, dum inter tantas palatii curas et regni occupationes philosophorum pleniter curavit arcana scire mysteria, quod vix otio torpens alius quis modo cognoscere studet.' Note suffixed to *Carmen Elegiacum*, Migne, ci 649.

CHAP. I.

Palace School. He was like the original settler clearing an open space in some virgin forest, and compelled to bestow no small amount of preliminary toil in removing the wild growths of centuries, before he breaks up the ground and sows the seed. On the other hand, he had the counterbalancing advantage of being bound by no traditions save those of the great doctors of the Church, whom he could interpret as his private judgement dictated. No predecessor in the Palace School—if indeed the school can be held to have had a previous existence—had already opened up a path which Alcuin might have found it equally difficult to follow or to desert. Holding as he did the very keys of knowledge, his statements and explanations were received with unquestioning deference. The dicta of Pythagoras himself obtained not more deferential assent. It is remarkable, considering how completely he rested upon authority, that he very rarely deems it necessary to cite an author when giving his decision.

Advantages under which he taught.

Alcuin not a philosopher.

That he possessed so little aptitude for philosophy was a serious drawback to his efficiency as a teacher, but it must, we think, be looked upon as a matter for congratulation that he stood identified with no philosophic school. He was neither a Platonist nor an Aristotelian. An able writer has indeed asserted that Alcuin was nothing more than a *grammarian*;[1] and it was in this capacity that his reputation undoubtedly stood highest even with his contemporaries. Notkerus, writing a century later, asserts that Alcuin's expositions of this, the first stage of the *trivium*, were so masterly, that 'Donatus, Nicomachus, and Priscian dwindled into insignificance when compared with him.'[2] Fortunately, the treatise is still extant, and we are consequently able to ascertain its precise value. The form into which the instruction is thrown, that of the dialogue, alone suffices to suggest the mental status of the majority of his pupils. The cate-

His reputation as a grammarian.

[1] Hauréau, pp. 125–6.

[2] 'Albinus talem grammaticam condidit, ut Donatus, Nicomachus, Dositheus, et noster Priscianus, in ejus comparatione nihil esse videantur' (quoted Migne, ci 849). With M. Hauréau, 'nous trouvons que Notker le Bègue exagère l'éloge.'

chetical method has generally been found the best adapted to the beginner, and many of Alcuin's pupils, whether as regards power of comprehension or actual knowledge, could only have been relegated, in any school, to the first or most elementary class.

His instruction in grammar at the Palatine School.

The dialogue on Grammar is carried on between two youths [1]—the one a Saxon, the other a Frank—respectively 16 and 15 years of age; the Saxon, as the elder, being accredited with the larger share of knowledge, and replying to the queries of the younger; while the master, in whose presence the dialogue is carried on, occasionally comes to his aid when the answer is beyond his ability. M. Monnier conjectures that it was Alcuin's design to exhibit Frankish ingenuity and 'esprit' in contrast to Saxon stolidity; and it is evident throughout that the questioner has the advantage in the opportunity afforded for raillery and wit, the respondent being anxious rather to establish a reputation for accuracy, and apparently somewhat inclined to resent a too pertinacious sounding of the depths of his knowledge. It is especially worthy of remark that, at the very outset, the writer designates the dialogue as a *disputatio;* and we can have no difficulty in recognising, as it were in embryo, the opponent and respondent of the famous contests of the schools. The contest, however, it will be observed, had not as yet assumed a dialectical form, the scholastic developement of the Aristotelian logic being still undreamt of, but appears in its more elementary stage as an intellectual trial of strength between two combatants.

Foreshadowing of the scholastic 'disputation.'

'Grammar' having been first of all defined as the 'scientia litteralis,' [2] the Frank commences by asking the Saxon why 'littera' is so called? 'I suppose,' replies the latter, '*littera* is the same as *legitera*, inasmuch as it forms the path of the reader.' *The Frank.* 'Give me its definition.' *The Saxon.* 'A letter is the smallest part of an articulate sound' (*vocis*).

The letter defined.

[1] Migne, ci 850–902.

[2] In obedience to the precept preserved in Boethius: 'Dicendi ac disputandi prima semper oratio est, et jam dialecticis autoribus et ipso M. Tullio saepius admonente, quae dicitur definitio.' *De Divisione*, Opera, p. 648.

CHAP. I.

The Frank. 'Master, has not *littera* another definition?'
The Master. 'It has, but one identical in meaning. The letter is the individual: for we divide sentences into clauses (*partes*), words into syllables, syllables into letters; but letters cannot be divided.'

The syllable.

In the conversation on the syllable we learn that it has three accents—the acute, the grave, the circumflex; two breathings, hard and soft; quantity, two short syllables being equivalent to one long; and number, according to the letters of which it is composed. Then the master enunciates an imposing definition of grammar: 'Grammar is the science of letters, the guardian of language and of a correct style. It is founded on nature, reason, authority, and usage. It is divided into 26 "species;" to wit, words, letters, syllables, clauses, sayings (*dictiones*), speeches, definitions, feet, accents, punctuations (*posituras*), critical marks (*notas*), orthographies, analogies, etymologies, glosses, differences (*differentiae*), barbarisms, solecisms, faults, metaplasms, schemata, tropes, prose, metre, fables, and histories.'

Throughout the whole discourse the instructor leans heavily on Donatus and Priscian; wherever, indeed, he attempts a less technical definition or explanation, the result is seldom to render matters clearer. The master's definition of the noun, for instance, confounds it with the adjective: 'its function,' he says, 'is to declare substance, quality, or quantity.' The Saxon pupil goes yet further astray; a noun, he says, 'is that part of speech which assigns to everybody or thing its common or its distinctive quality.' Evidently dissatisfied, however, with this, he appeals again to the master, who attempts another definition, with somewhat better success, declaring that the noun is 'vox significativa,' 'definitum aliquid significans;' and he then lets fall the pregnant observation, that 'there is but one substance, and that it is only names that differ.'[1]

Strange blunders.

Limitations with which the term *grammatica* was employed by Alcuin.

But by far the most significant feature in the dialogue are the limitations within which the subject itself is restricted, as compared with that wide conception of the study that

[1] 'Una est substantia, sed diversa nomina.' Migne, ci 859.

prevailed among the *grammatici* of the third and fourth centuries. The grammarian of the imperial schools, as we have already seen, was also the professed instructor in the critical study of the great poets and orators of antiquity. Even in Martianus we find the *ars grammatica* defined as the art which taught not merely *docte scribere legereque*, but also *erudite intelligere probareque*. But ever since the voice of the Church had declared against the function of the *grammaticus*, its profession among the Christian community had become rarer and rarer;[1] while ever since the time of Gregory the Great, the original interpretation of the study had dwindled to nothing more than a technical knowledge of the Latin language. Cassiodorus, who penned his definition about the time that Gregory was born, says, *grammatica est peritia pulchre loquendi ex poetis illustribus oratoribusque collecta*,[2] a definition which Gregory not unsuccessfully laboured to set aside. Among those who in his day still upheld the traditional conception was Didier, the archbishop of Vienne. It appears that he even ventured to give instruction in harmony with that conception, but was sternly called to account by the papal remonstrance. The letter is still extant[3] in which Gregory expresses his concern 'that you, my brother, give instruction in *grammar*;' 'inasmuch as,' he adds, 'the praises of Christ cannot be uttered by the same tongue as those of Jove.'[4]

It is scarcely necessary to add that Alcuin's view is in accordance with that of Gregory, and that, while admitting that 'fables and histories' (the poets and the historians) belong to the subject under discussion, he scrupulously abstains from dwelling on this aspect of the study. His treatment, indeed, is guardedly technical and limited; while following Donatus

[1] Of this the rarity of Christian monumental inscriptions whereon the name is described as that of a *grammaticus* is significant evidence. Passionei (*Iscrizioni antiche*, Lucca, 1763, p. 115) gives one rare exception.

[2] Migne, lxix 1152.

[3] *Epist.* II 54.

[4] Guizot here observes, 'Je ne sais trop ce que les louanges de Dieu ou de Jupiter pouvaient avoir à démêler avec la grammaire' (ii 120). It will be seen that his observation arises from a misapprehension with respect to the sense in which the term was originally employed.

CHAP. I.

and Priscian, he gives ample evidence that these writers were but imperfectly comprehended: and it is mainly as an illustration of the educated intelligence of the time that the treatise can be regarded as possessing any literary value. The task of classification and definition seems, as yet, to have been almost beyond the strength of the unpractised intellect; and, as Monnier observes, the mind, bewildered by the multiplicity of phenomena, and, unable to distinguish between the substance and its manifestations, often designated the former by the manifestations themselves.

Alcuin's views on orthography.

Another notable illustration of the state of culture at this period is afforded in Alcuin's treatise appended to that on Grammar, entitled *De Orthographia*,[1] designed chiefly as a kind of Antibarbarus or enumeration of words in frequent use especially liable to be misspelt. The transitional state of the Latin language at this period invests these instructions with a certain philological interest. In the ordinary speech of Neustria and Aquitaine, Latin had conquered Celtic and now found itself confronted by Tudesque. The *lingua Romana*, of which the earliest specimen extant belongs to half a century later, was only in process of formation; and the pronunciation of words was singularly perplexed and uncertain. Alcuin accordingly finds it necessary to distinguish not only *b* from *v* (which are to be found confused so early as the fourth century), but also from *u* and from *f*.[2] If you mean wool, he says, you must write *vellus;* if handsome, *bellus;* if a heap, *acervus;* if cruel, *acerbus;* if a reed, *avena;* if a rein, *habena;* the *Abari* are not necessarily *avari*. The conjunction 'or' is *vel;* gall is *fel;* the name of the heathen deity (*idolum*) *Bel*. He tells us that *f* resembles in shape the letter known as the digamma; but as the sound of that letter was

Value of his treatise.

[1] Migne, ci 902–919.

[2] The disappearance of the *b* in many words appears to have been effected by its transmutation into a *v;* the *v* becoming in turn absorbed in a preceding or following vowel or diphthong. Ampère observes that in the ancient language we find *boivre* instead of *boire;* the *v* representing the second *b* in *bibere*, just as the *v* in reçoivre (for recevoir) represents the *p* in *recipere*. *Hist. de la formation de la langue française* (ed. 1869), p. 248. Cf. Roby, *Latin Gram.* i 410.

more accurately represented by the letter *v*, it was decided to write *votum*, *virgo*, instead of *fotum*, *firgo*. It is questionable whether he himself did not pronounce *albus* and *alvus* alike; for he observes that when you mean *ventrem* you must write it with *u* digammon; when the colour, with a *b*. The following distinction would seem to shew that the Teutonic vagueness in the pronunciation of the terminal *d* led to a similar confusion of that letter with *t*: '*Quot*, quando numerus est, per *t*: quando pronomen per *d* scribendum est.'[1] Some of his derivations, with their explanations, are amusing: 'Magister, major in statione; nam *isteron* Graece statio dicitur.' '*Veniunt*, qui vendunt; *veneunt*, qui venduntur.' He speaks of a verb *sero*, *seras*, *seravi*, meaning to shut, and he derives it from *sera*, i.e. *vespera*; for the gates of a city are shut *late* in the day, i.e. at nightfall, and hence the bars with which they are closed are called *serae!*

Real extent of his Greek scholarship.

On the much disputed question with respect to the amount of Greek scholarship that existed in England at this period, Alcuin's writings afford valuable evidence; and that evidence must be considered conclusive against any high estimate. The mediaeval tendency to exaggerate the acquirements of great teachers, and to magnify a very slender acquaintance with any branch of learning not included in the *trivium* or *quadrivium* into a mastery of the subject, together with a too literal acceptance of such exaggerations, have led not a few modern writers to infer that the attainments of the scholars of this period were far beyond what we know the opportunities and culture of the times would render probable. That Theodorus himself possessed a competent knowledge of Greek literature is beyond question, and though the testimony of Lambarde and the conclusions of archbishop Parker are open to considerable doubt,[2] it is highly probable that

[1] Ampère observes that in old French they wrote *verd* for *vert*; *tart* for *tard*; *grant* for *grand*, *parlad* for *parlat*. *Hist. de la formation de la langue française* (ed. 1869), p. 244.

[2] 'The reverend father Matthew, now archbishop of Canterbury (whose care for the conservation of monuments can never be sufficiently commended), shewed me, not long since, the Psalter of David and sundry Homilies in Greek, Homer also and some other Greek authors, beautifully written on thick paper with the name of this Theodore prefixed in the front, to whose

CHAP. I.

Tradition of Greek in England.

his influence was successfully exerted to promote the study of the Greek language in England. Bede, long afterwards, gives testimony that, as the result of the archbishop's efforts, there were, in his (Bede's) day, scholars still living 'as well versed in the Greek and Latin tongues as in their own in which they were born,'[1] among whom the most eminent appears to have been Albinus. But although we may readily allow that Theodorus spoke with facility the language of his native Tarsus, the Greek of the Septuagint and the New Testament, and may be willing to believe that during the interval between his death, in 690, and that of Bede, in 735, efforts were made to promote Greek learning, the evidence of its having become a permanent study at York is altogether wanting. The very words of Bede, 'still living,' would seem to belong to a description of an acquirement already on the wane; and over against the presumption that Alcuin had, as the foremost scholar at that seat of learning, been one of the few who still represented its tradition, we necessarily place the evidence afforded by his works.

Bede's testimony.

Alcuin's Greek quotations mostly from Jerome.

With respect then to the numerous quotations from the Greek to be found in Alcuin's writings, we observe that nearly all, if not all, are to be found in the works of St. Jerome, the great interpreter between the Christian literature of the East and that of the West. These quotations are, as we should expect to find, correctly given; but whenever Alcuin attempts an independent display of Greek learning he generally blunders egregiously. It is not simply that he gives specimens of his scholarship of no greater value than the following: '*Hippocrita* Graece, in Latino, simulator. *Hippo* enim Graece falsum, *chrisis* judicium interpretatur.'[2] False etymologies are to be found in the writings of better Greek scholars than Alcuin; but the erroneous form of the nominative is far more suspicious, especially when considered in connexion with the fact that whenever he gives us a

Inaccurate Greek forms.

library he reasonably thought (being thereto led by show of great antiquity) that they sometime belonged.' Lambarde, *Perambulation of Kent* (1576), 233 (quoted in Edwards' *Memoirs of Libraries*, i 101).

[1] *Eccles. Hist.* bk. iv, c. 2. [2] Migne, ci 910.

Greek nominative, it appears, as often as not, with an incorrect termination. M. Hauréau very pertinently asks how it is that Alcuin, if he really knew Greek, gives us the Greek names for the Categories so incorrectly; and, along with the latest editors of his works, calls attention to the fact that the few Hebrew words that occur in the commentaries on Genesis and Ecclesiastes are also all to be found in Jerome.[1]

Illustration from Ozanam of superficial criticism in relation to the learning of the period.

Of the uncritical facility with which even well-informed writers have accredited the scholars of these times with attainments not merely out of proportion to the learning of the age but in themselves in the highest degree improbable, we have, in connexion with Alcuin, more than one notable example. The following may serve as an illustration. M. Ozanam, one of the most enthusiastic panegyrists of the men and learning of these centuries, lays considerable stress on the fact that Alcuin, in one of his letters, is to be found advising Angilbert to correct a copy of the Psalter by the aid of the text of the Greek Septuagint.[2] On a *prima facie* view of this assertion, and with every disposition to augur favourably of the attainments of a son-in-law of Charles the Great and the father of Nithard, the historian, we must confess that a task of this description appears hardly consonant with what we know of Angilbert's acquirements and character. In his younger years he was distinguished by his passion for what, in modern phrase, would be termed 'theatricals'—a feature which Alcuin (with whom he was a special favourite) regarded with concern. When Charles' son Pepin went to rule in Italy, Angilbert went with him as his mayor of the palace. During his residence in Italy, the latter was attacked by a serious illness, which he construed into a mark of the divine displeasure; and shortly afterwards, in the year 790, he retired to the venerable monastery of St. Riquier, 'Centulla of the hundred towers.' There, in his capacity of abbat, he exchanged his passion for plays for an equally fond devotion to music; and it became the boast of St. Riquier that the voice of sacred song was never silent

[1] *De la philosophie scholastique* (ed. 1872), i 126.
[2] Ozanam, p. 521.

CHAP. I.

within her walls. A poem attributed to Angilbert by Pertz, and written during this period of his life, evinces a like love of ornament and splendour. It is scarcely therefore at the hands of Angilbert that we should be inclined to look for the performance of a labour such as that to which Ozanam refers. But the fact is that, on further enquiry, the statement appears to be entirely without foundation. On turning to the letter in question,[1] we find that Angilbert had consulted Alcuin with respect to the preferable mode of writing certain Latin words; as, for example, whether one ought to write *dispexeris* or *despexeris*. Alcuin, in reply, falls back on authority, and refers to Priscian, who says, rightly enough, that such difficulties are often to be decided by reference to the corresponding Greek word, and ascertaining whether the preposition there used is that for which the Latin *dis-* is the accepted equivalent, or whether that rendered by *de-*. After giving a series of examples, he goes on to say, 'as I have before observed, we must see what preposition would be required in Greek, and from thence decide which is to be used in Latin; inasmuch as the doubt admits of being solved by reference to the former language. Habet enim in Graeco ille versus: "Exaudi, Deus, orationem meam et ne despexeris precationem meam," Ἐνώτισαι, ὁ Θεὸς, τὴν προσευχήν μου, καὶ μὴ ὑπερίδῃς τὴν δέησίν μου. (Psalm liv 2.)' Other examples from the Septuagint, taken from Jerome, follow; and the Commentary on the Epistle to Titus by the same Father is quoted (in itself a suspicious circumstance) for an observation on the force of the prepositions περὶ and κατά. But as for a collation of the Latin Psalter with the Septuagint, or advising Angilbert to undertake such a task, not a word occurs either in this letter or in any one of the three others, still extant, addressed by Alcuin to 'Homerus.'

Alcuin's attempts to amuse his scholars.

The attempt to enliven the treatise on Grammar by a somewhat forced attempt at humour (an idea not improbably derived from Martianus Capella) cannot be pronounced very successful, but it is a significant sign of the intellectual level of the students for whose benefit the work was designed.

[1] *Epist.* 27. (Migne, c 180–184.)

The younger members of the Palace School seem to have required to be at once instructed and amused, much after the way that would now seem well adapted to a night-school of Somersetshire rustics; while Alcuin's knowledge of Greek can scarcely be supposed to have exceeded that of an intelligent schoolboy well on in his First Delectus.

Our estimate of Alcuin's acquirements as a grammarian, the branch of learning in which his superiority was most unquestioned, differs, as will be seen, considerably from that of Notkerus; it will, however, compare favourably with that which the facts compel us to form respecting his attainments in some other branches of the *trivium* and *quadrivium*. In the treatise on Rhetoric,[1] which stands next in his *Opera didascalica*, and was composed on his return from England in 793, he gives us what purports to be a dialogue between the monarch and himself. It need scarcely be said that no attempt at drollery like that in the *De Grammatica* appears. Charles seeks to be instructed in the art from the same practical motives that guided all his conceptions; it was the art which was concerned with civil disputes (*civiles quaestiones*); 'and you well know,' he says, 'that the affairs of our realm and of our court are constantly bringing such disputes before us, and it would be ridiculous to remain in ignorance of the precepts of an art of which one feels the want every day of one's life.' The art of rhetoric is defined by Alcuin as that of 'speaking well' (*bene dicendi*)—it is the art of forensic combat. As it is natural to all, though unversed in warfare, to defend themselves and attack their foes, so it is almost equally an impulse of nature to accuse others and vindicate oneself. But though nature herself dictates this use of speech, those who speak according to the rules of art (*per grammaticam*) greatly excel the rest. Aristotle and Cicero, it need scarcely be said, are the Alpha and Omega of Alcuin's tractate.[2] The prominence given to rhetoric in the imperial schools had led to the transcription of the

His Rhetoric.

His definition of rhetoric.

[1] Migne, ci 919–948.

[2] 'Alcuin voulut compléter Cicéron par l'addition des préceptes subtils d'Aristote, mais il n'a réussi qu'à gâter la clarté du maître de l'éloquence latine.' Léon Maitre, p. 223.

CHAP. I.

great Roman orator's minor rhetorical treatises to an extent which rendered them, at this period, certainly the commonest of all the productions of the classical era, and scarcely less frequently to be met with than the Encyclopaediasts themselves. It is rarely that a catalogue of a library of the eighth or ninth century fails to shew the existence of at least one copy of the *Topica*. The *De inventione rhetorica* is almost as common; and even the spurious treatise *ad Herennium* is of frequent occurrence. In Alcuin's meagre compend, the graceful prose, the felicitous narrative, the subtle analysis of Cicero's page find, of course, no place. No highly wrought conception of the ideal orator, like that which floated before the mind of the author of the *Orator* and the *De Oratore*, disturbed the composure of the teacher of the Palace School with a vision which language was inadequate fully to reproduce. The Ciceronian discussion of details, such as the *numerosa oratio* and *rhythmus*, the different styles of oratory, and the *lumina verborum*, which add so much to the interest of the treatment in the *Orator*, dwindles to a meagre outline of two short pages under the head of *De Elocutione*. For illustrations of his subject Alcuin prefers to go to Scripture. The divine acceptance of Abel's offering and the rejection of Cain's is his example of the *genus demonstrativum;* the opposing counsels of Ahithophel and Hushai to Absalom, of the *genus deliberativum;* St. Paul, on his defence before Felix and defending himself against the charges of his accusers, of the *genus judiciale*.

Meagre treatment of the subject.

It is evidently on the moral aspects of the orator's training that he dwells with most satisfaction. In speaking of memory in relation to oratory, he gives Cicero's definition, *thesaurus omnium rerum*. Charles thereupon enquires if Cicero suggests any means of acquiring and strengthening the faculty? To which Alcuin replies, none beyond regular practice in speaking, practice in writing, and the habit of reflecting; together with the advice to avoid intemperance, as the chief foe of all liberal studies, and the destroyer not only of bodily health but also of mental soundness. He then enlarges on the necessity that the orator's daily habits and

He descants on the moral qualifications of the orator.

practice should be in harmony with the aims and requirements of the part which he aspires to play in public life. Even in ordinary intercourse his expression should be carefully chosen, should be chaste, clear, simple, distinctly uttered, and accompanied by composed expression of countenance: there must be no immoderate laughter, no noisiness of tone. In speaking, as in walking, there is a just medium; and temperance is the root of all those virtues which go to make up nobility of soul, dignity of life, purity of morals, and praiseworthy mental culture. Stoical discourse, and by no means without its relevance to certain failings in the Frankish character; perhaps, not altogether impertinent to Charles himself, who, if we read Einhard rightly, sometimes appeared 'quasi dicaculus.' Towards the close of the treatise, as Alcuin proceeds to dilate on man's moral nature and the cardinal virtues, it suddenly occurs to Charles to ask whether these are not the very virtues which Christianity itself places in the foremost rank, and Alcuin frankly admits that such is the case. How then, asks Charles, did the philosophers come to concern themselves about them? Alcuin replies that they perceived the elements of these virtues in human nature and cultivated them with the greatest ardour. What then, asks the monarch, constitutes the difference between a philosopher like this and a Christian? Alcuin replies, 'faith and baptism.'

Alcuin's distinction between the moral philosopher and the Christian teacher.

Passing on to the subject of Logic,[1] we shall find that Alcuin presents still less of originality, and it may be added, of intelligence. But here, again, it must in justice be admitted that the proscription of the Church had operated with yet greater force than in the province of the grammarian. If the calling of the *grammaticus* was regarded with contempt or suspicion, that of the *dialecticus* was looked upon with absolute aversion. It has been alleged, and probably with reason, that much of this feeling took its rise in the fact, that the defenders of the orthodox faith too often found themselves completely worsted by their antagonists when they endeavoured to conduct a controversy after the prescribed fashion

Logic.

Traditional views of the Church with respect to the dialectic art.

[1] *De Dialectica*, Migne, ci 951–979.

CHAP. I.

of the schools. The epithet flung at Aristotle by Faustinus the Luciferian, of 'the bishop of the Arians,' and the sarcastic saying of John of Damascus, that the Monophysites had made the great Stagirite a thirteenth apostle, indicate the prejudice that had been created against the art of logic[1]—the only one, as we have already seen, in which, at this period, the influence of Aristotle can be said to be distinctly recognisable. Hence, from almost the earliest times of Christianity, we are confronted by a formidable *consensus* of authority against dialectical contests like those which had once delighted the disciples of the Academy and the Stoa. Even apostolic teaching, it was claimed, had clearly pronounced such contests worse than useless; and it is not a little significant that a critic so eminent as Longinus, while paying a high tribute to the oratorical genius of St. Paul, declared that he had 'asserted a doctrine indemonstrable by proof.'[2] Nor can it be denied that more than one passage in the Pauline Epistles may be cited, which seems to glance with little favour at the customary weapons of Gentile controversy, and not improbably gave tone to the language of the Fathers.'[3] Irenaeus, in the second century, is loud in his complaint of those 'who oppose the Faith with an Aristotelian word-chopping (*minutiloquium*) and excess of refinement in argument.'[4] 'Unhappy Aristotle,' exclaims Tertullian, 'the inventor of dialectic, artful in building up and cunning to destroy, ... injurious even to its own master, revoking everything lest it should seem to have treated aught explicitly.'[5] 'Wanted we the syllogisms of Aristotle or of Chrysippus,' cried St. Basil to his antagonist,

[1] See on this subject Dr. J. H. Newman's comments, *Essays*, ii 42; also Prantl, ii 1–10.

[2] If we may accept the somewhat doubtful fragment where, after enumerating, as oratorical models, Demosthenes, Lysias, Aeschines, Aristides, Isaeus, Isocrates, etc., he adds, Πρὸς τούτοις Παῦλος ὁ Ταρσεύς, ὄντινα καὶ πρῶτόν φημι προϊστάμενον δόγματος ἀναποδείκτου. Longinus (ed. Vaucher), pp. 310–1.

[3] See 1 Cor. ii 17; 1 Thess. i 5; 1 Tim. vi 3–6.

[4] *Adv. Haeres.* II xviii 5; with allusion probably to the Basilidians see ed. by W. W. Harvey, i 296.

[5] *De Praescript.* c. 7; Migne, ii 20.

'to teach us that the Unbegotten could never have been born?'[1] 'We need not the nets of the dialecticians or the thorn bushes of Aristotle,' says Jerome, 'but the words of the Scriptures themselves.'[2] 'They know not Christ,' says Eusebius, of the pagan party, 'but seek with pains what figure of the syllogism can be found to confirm their unbelief; should one chance to bring forward the testimony of Holy Writ, they reply by asking whether he can construct the conjunctive or disjunctive figure of the syllogism. Skilled in the cunning and subtlety of the ungodly, they corrupt the simple and natural truth of Scripture.'[3] Socrates, the historian, bears witness to the existence of the same feeling in his own time, when he tells us that Aetius the Arian amazed his hearers by the novelty of his teaching, 'relying on the categories of Aristotle.'[4] In the seventh century we find Theodorus Rhaituensis declaring that his opponent, Severus of Antioch, estimated a theologian according to his knowledge of the same treatise, and of 'the other refinements of pagan philosophy.'[5]

CHAP. I.

When such were the sentiments of many of the most distinguished teachers of the Church, it can be no matter for surprise that a mind like Alcuin's regarded with something more than distrust an art so emphatically decried. If partly reconciled to its introduction into the schools by the fact that it had been sanctioned, to some extent, by the revered authority of Isidorus, he seems to have been resolved to do nothing towards adding to that sanction by his own example. As Isidorus, following Cassiodorus, treats of dialectic and rhetoric under the general head of logic, Alcuin mechanically reproduces the same arbitrary classification.

These views plainly reflected in Alcuin's treatise.

[1] *Adv. Eunom.* bk. I; Ibid. (S. G.) xxix 516.

[2] *Adv. Helvid.*; Ibid. xxiii 185.

[3] *Hist. Ecclesiast.* v 27.

[4] Τοῦτο δὲ ἐποίει, ταῖς κατηγορίαις Ἀριστοτέλους πιστεύων. *Hist. Eccles.* ii 35; Migne (S. G.), lxvii 297. Aristotle, in Socrates' opinion, only composed his logical treatises in order to place his disciples on equal terms with the Sophists.

[5] After quoting St. Paul, 1 Cor. iv 20, Οὕτως δὲ παρ' αὐτῷ Σευήρῳ κράτιστος θεολόγος γνωρίζεται, ὡσὰν τὰς κατηγορίας Ἀριστοτέλους καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν ἔξω φιλοσόφων κομψὰ ἠσκημένος τυγχάνῃ. *De Incarnat.*, Migne (S. G.), xci 1504.

CHAP. I.

After quoting the old simile, handed down from Varro, whereby dialectic and rhetoric are compared to the clenched and the open hand,[1] he proceeds to tell us how dialectic is subdivided, namely, into *isagogae, categoriae, syllogismorum formulae, diffinitiones, topica, periermeniae,*—'a monstrous arrangement,' as Prantl not unreasonably observes. All that follows in the chapter *De Isagogis* is from Isidorus, excepting that an example is supplied under each heading by way of illustration. In the same manner the enumeration of the Categories is taken from the Pseudo-Augustin, the Greek words being given in barbarous Latin forms. Between these two sources, together with a little from Boethius, Alcuin ekes out his treatise on Dialectic—'ein abenteuerlicher Compilation eines Compendiums,' to quote his eminent critic once more, wherein 'not even the abstract logical necessity of a certain coherence of succession is discernible.'[2] Even Fredegis' eccentric treatise, *De Nihilo et Tenebris*, seems to him an advance on such mechanical drudgery as this.

His treatment of arithmetic and astronomy.

In like manner, Alcuin's treatment of the subjects of the *quadrivium*[3] is a mere echo of the Encyclopaedists, with a somewhat larger infusion of superstitious mysticism. In arithmetic we find him attributing a mysterious power to the numbers 3 and 6, which he speaks of as containing 'the keys of nature.' A treatise which he compiled on music is no longer extant. In astronomy fancy, or arbitrary hypothesis, supplied the place of observation; while the ray of light that flashed from the page of Capella upon the dark system of Ptolemy[4] appears never even to have arrested his attention. In the month of July, 797, the planet Mars disappeared from the heavens, and was not again visible until the following July. Charles, whose interest in astronomical questions was singularly active, enquired eagerly of Alcuin

His explanation of an astronomical phenomenon.

[1] 'Dialecticam et rhetoricam Varro in novem disciplinarum libris tali similitudine definivit: dialectica et rhetorica est quod in manu hominis pugnus astrictus et palma distensa, illa verba contrahens, ista distendens.' Cassiodorus, Dial. 3, ed. Venet. 1739, p. 536. See also Isidorus, *Origines*, II 23.

[2] *Gesch. d. Logik*, ii 14–16.

[3] Migne, ci 979–984, 1143–1159.

[4] See supra, p. 66, note 1.

the cause of this portentous phenomenon; and was met by the facetious reply that the sun had detained the planet in its course, but had at last again released it through fear of the Nemean lion![1]

Alcuin as a theologian.

The foregoing account may suffice to illustrate the character of what may be termed Alcuin's technical instruction in the Palatine School; but it would be very imperfectly to estimate his influence were we to omit to notice how it operated in relation to that study in which, according to the grand old mediaeval notion, not only the *trivium* and *quadrivium*, but all human knowledge culminated,—the study of theology. Of his acquaintance with the Scriptures themselves his controversial treatises, those against the Adoptionist leaders Elipandus and Felix, would alone be sufficient proof, and may be held fairly to justify the assertion of the monk of St. Gall, that Alcuin was 'familiar with the whole of the sacred writings beyond all others of his age.'[2] His reputation with his contemporaries stood not less high. At the great Council of Frankfort in 794, though neither bishop nor abbat, he was assigned a seat and permitted to share in the deliberations, on the ground of 'his attainments in Church learning.'[3]

His controversy with the Adoptionists.

His adherence to the traditions of the Latin Church.

Of his views as a churchman we have already spoken—he trod in the steps of Gregory and Bede; and in the interpretation of Scripture he yielded them the same obedience. To teach what the Fathers taught—to interpret every passage by the light of preceding investigation—such were the canons he laid down, and they were faithfully adhered to by his disciples. M. Monnier observes[4] that the theologians of

[1] In allusion to the planet having again become visible in the sign of Leo. Migne, c 275.

[2] 'Qui erat in omni latitudine scripturarum super caeteros modernorum temporum exercitatus.' Pertz, ii 731.

[3] *De Alcuino, quem rex synodo commendavit.* 'Commonuit etiam ut Alcuinum ipsa sancta synodus in suo consortio sive in orationibus recipere dignaretur, eo quod esset vir in ecclesiasticis doctrinis eruditus.' Baluze, i 270.

[4] P. 204. 'Alcuin,' he says, 'est le répresentant le plus complet de cette théologie orthodoxe mais craintive, plus abondante en livres qu'en idées.'

CHAP. I.

Fulda, of St. Gall, and Corbey, all reproduce the same method of theological teaching. Of Alcuin's tenets in general it may be said, that nothing could be more unmistakeably opposed to that theory of developement on which certain writers have so strenuously insisted in vindicating the views put forth by the mediaeval Church. In his commentary on the penitential psalms, he gives us little more than the expositions of Augustine and Cassiodorus—in expounding the Epistles to Titus and Philemon, he reproduces St. Jerome—in treating the Epistle to the Hebrews, he has recourse to St. Chrysostom, and prefers altogether to pass by the question raised by Jerome regarding its authenticity. His treatise *De Fide Trinitatis* aspires to nothing more than to render somewhat more intelligible the doctrine of St. Augustine. His commentary on St. John is compiled partly from the same Father, partly from Ambrose, Gregory, and others. His exposition of the Apocalypse is a mere echo of Bede.

His influence specially discernible in the promotion of a spirit of deference for authority.

In no respect indeed is Alcuin's influence on the Carolingian schools more distinctly perceptible than in the manner in which he thus perpetuated and enhanced the authority of the Fathers. In his mystic interpretation of Scripture the influence of St. Ambrose, in his *Hexaemeron*, and perhaps also that of Cassian, is especially to be noted: Alcuin appears to have taught in Frankland the science for which Boniface was vaguely renowned. The *sensus litteralis* of a passage having been first unfolded—that is to say, a critical, historical, and grammatical examination of its meaning having been given—the commentator passes on to what in his view was by far the more important part—the *sensus allegorialis*. In this direction the most lively fancy and ingenuity could have craved for no greater license than that which commentators like Bede and Alcuin assume in attributing a latent figurative meaning to the most prosaic expressions. The marriage at Cana is said by St. John to have taken place on the *third day;* this, says Alcuin, is designed to imply that our Lord came to elect his Church in the *third age*—the *first* having been that of the patriarchs, the *second* of the prophets, the *third* of the Evangelists. There were *six* waterpots, because six

His tendency to an allegorical interpretation of Scripture.

centuries elapsed before prophecy became fulfilled in our Lord's actual appearance.[1] The *triclinium* on which the guests reposed at table denoted the *three* divisions of the faithful—the married, those vowed to celibacy (*continentes*), and the teachers.[2] The 'four living creatures,' described by Ezekiel, typified the four Evangelists. In the conversation with Sigulfus on the Book of Genesis the question is raised, why animals that live on land are more accursed than those that live in the water? The reply is, because they consume more of the fruits of the earth, which was cursed; for the same reason Christ, after He had risen from the dead, preferred to eat fish rather than flesh![3]

Influence of his example in this direction.

This morbid passion for analogy, almost as arbitrary and fantastic in its exercise as the fancy which thinks to discern strange shapes and fearful visages in the heavenly constellations, assumes no ordinary importance when we recall how potent was its influence on the whole current of mediaeval theology. The vast tomes which, at the present day, occupy so large a space in our ancient libraries, the monuments of the labours of Hugo of St. Victor, of Hugo of St. Cher, and Nicolas de Lyra, reflect the teaching of Alcuin; the lessons of the Palatine School and the expositions at Tours were revived, long after, by the great doctors who taught in the University of Paris.

The pretensions of mediaeval and modern teachers contrasted.

It is impossible to deny, when comparing the mental characteristics of these distant times with those of our own day, that the comparative modesty of assumption which distinguishes our ablest writers on science offers one of the most favourable points of contrast. The tone of scientific investigators and discoverers may often be far from reverent, yet we cannot but recognise in the habits of mind developed by research of this character an influence eminently repressive of vague assertion and unverified hypothesis. The necessity for rigid accuracy in all processes that involve the employment of numbers—the chastening discipline of oft-repeated failure and of errors of conception, brought home to the enquirer by

[1] Migne, c 770.

[2] 'Quia nimirum tres sunt ordines fidelium quibus ecclesia constat: conjugatorum videlicet, continentium, et doctorum.' Migne, c 771.

[3] Ibid. c 518.

CHAP. I.

the very data he has himself assumed—the distrust that at last becomes habitual of all conclusions that do not admit of at least approximate verification—are little favourable to a dictatorial spirit in any province of knowledge. But at the time that Alcuin lived, and for centuries after, no such restraining influence existed. Fancy and invention roved through the whole domain of letters unchecked. Miracle, legend, and gross exaggeration passed alike unchallenged and unsuspected. The popular mind, delighting in the marvellous, was willing to be deceived, and was deceived accordingly. In no respect are the effects of this tendency more clearly discernible than in connexion with the history of individuals, especially of those who aspired to be the instructors of their age. Men hailed the appearance of some great doctor who, like Alan of the Isles, knew or professed to know the whole circle of the sciences—who, by virtue of traditional learning or original genius, had an answer ready for every enquiry, a solution for every difficulty. An instructor who had frankly confessed that he too was but an enquirer, often baffled, often perplexed, would have found his reputation gone. It would require a long search through the pages of the *doctor subtilis*, the *doctor angelicus*, or the *doctor irrefragibilis* to discover any such avowal.

Difficulties of Alcuin's position.

It is not difficult to perceive that the prevalence of exaggerated notions of this character proved a fatal snare to Alcuin. Expectation at the court of Charles the Great had been roused to the highest pitch by the fame of this great doctor from beyond the seas. The circle that gathered in the Palatine School looked not merely for the grammarian and the theologian, which Alcuin might fairly claim to be, but also for the logician, the metaphysician, and the natural philosopher, which he was not. It would, of course, have been perfectly in his power to disavow his ability to satisfy these exorbitant requirements, but it is certain that such a course would have been attended with much humiliation. It was not simply that the marked distinction with which he had been received, and the royal favours lavished upon him, must have incited him to his utmost efforts to approve himself a

deserving recipient, but, as we shall hereafter see, there were those at hand who were only too ready to profit by any backwardness on his part and at once to occupy the chair which he would vacate. These were men whom he regarded as enemies of the true faith, and he would naturally be led, not less by a spirit of loyalty to the Church than by individual interest, to seek to prevent their winning the royal ear, and disseminating false doctrine throughout the court.

His contradictions in questions of metaphysics.

The mechanical and defective character of Alcuin's treatment of logic will prepare us to moderate our expectations when he approaches the subject of metaphysics. The celebrated passage in Porphyry, whence sprung the scholastic controversy concerning Universals, had not, as yet, become the subject of debate, but enquiry already hovered not far off from the great battle-field of mediaeval philosophy. The theory of Aristotle respecting the relations of 'substance' to 'entity' is sufficiently intelligible. At the commencement of the Categories,[1] he defines *οὐσία*, or substance, as essentially the property of the individual; so far from being, as Plato held, a Universal, it was simply that which furnished the primary notion of *being*, as the *substratum* of the individual. This teaching is preserved with sufficient clearness in Isidorus, who also preserves the well-known distinction by which, according as it is regarded as denoting independent existence or as a basis of attributes, it is derived, in the first instance, from *subsistendo*, in the second, from *substando*.[2]

'Substance,' 'essence,' and 'being.'

Whether, in agreement with Sir William Hamilton, we consider that, whichever derivation we accept, the term has reference to the same thing (viewed, however, under a different aspect), or with M. Hauréau, that a distinction is involved between 'being' and 'substance,' the neglect of which lands us in 'pure Spinozism,'[3] it is undeniable that the distinction is one of primary importance, and is to be found even in

[1] Ch. iii.

[2] 'Usiæ autem, id est substantiae, proprium est, quod caeteris subjacet reliqua novem accidentia sunt. Substantia autem dicitur ab eo quod omnis res ad seipsam subsistit. Corpus enim subsistit, et ideo substantia est. *Etymol.* II 26; Migne, lxxxii 144–5.

[3] *Philosophie Scholastique*, i 72.

CHAP. I.

Isidorus. In Alcuin's exposition, however, it effectually eludes comprehension. He tells us, indeed, quoting from Isidorus, that '*substantia* is so called because it is that which subsists, i.e. imparts to every entity (*natura*) its distinctive shape;' but somewhat further on he proceeds to define 'substance,' and informs us that *οὐσία* (*substantia*) is that which is discerned by the bodily sense, while *accidens* (*συμβεβηκός*), he adds, is that which is apprehended only by the mind. Then he adds, strangely enough, that *οὐσία* has also been termed *ὑποκείμενον*, that is, he explains (the scholastic *substratum* not having been yet invented), *subjacens*.[1]

It is not surprising that teaching which thus slurred over an all-important distinction, and then proceeded to define *phaenomena* as discernible only by the intellect, tended much to mystify his disciples. Arno, his fellow-countryman, was especially puzzled, and wrote to beg for a concise explanation as to the real meaning of the different terms—*substantia*, *essentia*, and *subsistentia*. He wanted particularly to know whether the supreme Being could be termed a 'substance.' Alcuin, in his reply, falls back upon the ordinary acceptation of the first term, and explains that *substantia* is a common name for every existing thing—sun, moon, trees, animals, man himself; 'substance' is essential to existence, and hence God Himself is a substance, the chief, the primary substance,[2] and the cause of all substances. Such a conception, he holds, is directly opposed to the 'Arian poison,' and he dilates on its theological value; but he vouchsafes his correspondent no aid whatever in arriving at a philosophical discrimination in the use of the foregoing terms, and Arno must have felt as far from a satisfactory result as ever.

Divergence of theory in his pupils.

When the teacher laid down the canons in such dubious and even contradictory terms, it is not surprising that he

[1] 'Nam id quod corporali sensu discernitur, usian, id est, substantiam dici jusserunt. Illud autem, quod animi tractatu solum colligitur, aut saepe mutatur, synubebicos, id est, accidens nominari maluerunt. *Usian* quoque ypocimenon, id est, subjaciens appellare voluerunt.' *De Dialectica*, Migne, ci 906.

[2] 'Deus igitur substantia est, et summa substantia, et prima substantia, et omnium substantiarum causa, quia omnium rerum creator est.' Migne, c 418.

should have failed to impress any distinct philosophic notions on his disciples, and that while we afterwards find the most distinguished inheritors of his traditions asserting the doctrines of Nominalism, others, like Fredegis, are to be seen espousing those of the extremest Realism. How singularly the latter, though the recognised successor of Alcuin, departed from his master's tenets may be gathered from the following instance. In one of Alcuin's letters to Charles there is an interesting passage, somewhat reminding us of the first book of Cicero's Tusculan Disputations, in which he argues that death is no evil; it is, in fact, not even a reality, but simply the absence of a reality—that is, of the vital principle: just, he goes on to add, as darkness is nothing but the absence of light—*sicut tenebrae nihil aliud sunt nisi absentia lucis.*[1] It is impossible to say whether Fredegis ever saw this letter—it appears to have been written at the time when he was presiding over the Palace School after Alcuin's retirement to Tours—but it is certainly somewhat remarkable that, taking for his motto the passage in St. Matthew, 'If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness!' he should have composed a treatise to prove that *nothing* and *darkness* are alike real entities! M. Hauréau, who speaks of Fredegis as 'le premier-né des réalistes du moyen-âge,' assumes that the treatise was written in reply to certain 'gens de peu de foi' at Charles' court. If so, it would appear that among these sceptically inclined individuals we must include Alcuin himself.[2]

Fredegis as a Realist.

Yet notwithstanding Alcuin's defects as a philosopher, his strong practical sagacity stood him in good stead. If his genius was little suited for speculative enquiry, it was also equally opposed to extravagant and fantastic theorisa-

[1] Migne, c 435. The Tusculans appear to have been well known to scholars at this period: Lupus of Ferrières, writing to Einhard, quotes from the first book. See *Einhardi Opera* (ed. Teulet), ii 157.

[2] The dispute seems to date back as far as the time of Isidorus:—'Non ex hoc substantiam habere credendae sunt tenebrae, quia dicit dominus per prophetam, "Ego dominus formam, lucem et creans tenebras," sed quia angelica natura, quae non est praevaricata, lux dicitur, illa autem quae praevaricata est, tenebrarum nomine nuncupatur.' *Sent.* i 2.

CHAP. I.

tion. We find him accordingly maintaining his ground at the Palace School with apparently undiminished reputation, while throughout the realm he could number among his friends the foremost men in Church and State. Besides those already enumerated as among his audience at court, there were three of especial eminence. The first, the friend to whom he seems to have been of all others most closely attached, was his fellow-countryman Arno, bishop of Salzburg, to whom many of his letters are addressed, and who, in his remote diocese, was energetically carrying on the noble work of St. Boniface. The second, Benedict of Aniane, had formerly been a page in the court of Pepin-le-Bref, and his chivalrous nature and prowess in the fight especially endeared him to Charles; but on him, too, had fallen the sorrow of his age, and he was now, in his cell on the Aniane,[1] withdrawn from life and famed for the austerity with which he there enforced the observance of the Benedictine rule. Equally eminent, though in different fashion, was Theodulfus, bishop of Orleans, the founder of the great school of Fleury, a Spaniard of Gothic descent who reflected the culture of southern Gaul, and whose name is memorable as that of the initiator of free education and an active guardian of letters.

Alcuin's chief friends:

Arno,

Benedict of Aniane,

and Theodulfus.

On every side, indeed, Alcuin appears to have found active sympathy and co-operation; and if the task to which he had been summoned was arduous, the resources at his disposal were proportionably great. Two important monasteries—one that of St. Loup near Troyes, the other that of Ferrières in the Gatinais—were placed under his control, and supplied him with a sufficient revenue; while in the work of educational reform he was supported by the whole of the royal influence. During the first five years that followed upon his arrival at Charles' court, it would appear, however, that the Saxon war effectually distracted the monarch's attention from efforts of a general and comprehensive character. But in the year 785 the hero Witikind laid down his arms and embraced Christianity. His example

Monasteries placed under his control.

[1] A river in Septimania (the modern Languedoc) remarkable for its wild and rugged scenery.

CHAP. I.

was followed by large numbers of his countrymen, the thunder-clouds of war rolled off to more distant parts of the empire, and Neustria and Austrasia had rest.[1]

Suspension of the Saxon war.

Within two years from this time we accordingly find Charles developing a more extended scheme of reformation, and calling upon the monasteries and the Church to aid him in giving due effect to his designs. In the famous Capitulary of 787 we recognise both the practical spirit of the monarch and the influence of his new adviser. The copy that has reached us is that addressed to the abbat of Fulda. Far away beyond the boundaries of modern France, a hundred miles eastward of the Rhine, amid the solitudes and wooded heights of Hesse Cassel, the monks of this now famous foundation maintained, in envied independence of episcopal control,[2] the observance of the rule of St. Benedict. As the site hallowed by the mortal remains of St. Boniface, Fulda appealed with peculiar force to the characteristic superstition of the age, scarce yielding to St. Martin itself in its claims to especial reverence; its abbat was one of the four *abbates imperii*, while its material importance is sufficiently indicated by supplies of men and money to the state in times of war,[3] and its frequent selection as the place of confinement for political prisoners. It was here that the abbat Baugulfus received a copy of the capitulary which Charles addressed to the bishops and abbats throughout the realm:—

Charles' Capitulary of 787.

'Charles, by the grace of God, King of the Franks and of the Lombards and Patrician of the Romans, to Baugulfus, abbat, and to his whole congregation and the faithful committed to his charge:

'Be it known to your devotion, pleasing to God, that in conjunction with our faithful we have judged it to be of

[1] 'Quievitque illa Saxonicae perfidiae pervicacitas per annos aliquot, ob hoc maxime, quoniam occasiones deficiendi ad rem pertinentes invenire non potuerunt.' Einhard, *Annales* (ed. Teulet), i 196.

[2] This was in accordance with the original plan of St. Boniface; see supra, p. 45, n. 2.

[3] Baluze, i 589. See also a letter from Einhard to Rabanus Maurus begging on behalf of one of the monks, 'ut sibi liceat iter exercitale, quod praesenti tempore agendum est, omittere.' *Carolina*, 469.

CHAP. I.

utility that, in the bishoprics and monasteries committed by Christ's favour to our charge, care should be taken that there shall be not only a regular manner of life and one conformable to holy religion, but also the study of letters, each to teach and learn them according to his ability and the divine assistance. For even as due observance of the rule of the house tends to good morals, so zeal on the part of the teacher and the taught imparts order and grace to sentences; and those who seek to please God by living aright should also not neglect to please Him by right speaking. It is written, "by thine own words shalt thou be justified or condemned;" and although right doing be preferable to right speaking, yet must the knowledge of what is right precede right action. Everyone, therefore, should strive to understand what it is that he would fain accomplish; and this right understanding will be the sooner gained according as the utterances of the tongue are free from error. And if false speaking is to be shunned by all men, especially should it be shunned by those who have elected to be the servants of the truth. During past years we have often received letters from different monasteries informing us that at their sacred services the brethren offered up prayers on our behalf; and we have observed that the thoughts contained in these letters, though in themselves most just, were expressed in uncouth language, and while pious devotion dictated the sentiments, the unlettered tongue was unable to express them aright. Hence there has arisen in our minds the fear lest, if the skill to write rightly were thus lacking, so too would the power of rightly comprehending the sacred Scriptures be far less than was fitting; and we all know that though verbal errors be dangerous, errors of the understanding are yet more so. We exhort you, therefore, not only not to neglect the study of letters, but to apply yourselves thereto with perseverance and with that humility which is well pleasing to God; so that you may be able to penetrate with greater ease and certainty the mysteries of the Holy Scriptures. For as these contain images, tropes, and similar figures, it is impossible to doubt that the reader will arrive far more readily at the

spiritual sense according as he is the better instructed in learning. Let there, therefore, be chosen for this work men who are both able and willing to learn, *and also desirous of instructing others;* and let them apply themselves to the work with a zeal equalling the earnestness with which we recommend it to them.

'It is our wish that you may be what it behoves the soldiers of the Church to be,—religious in heart, learned in discourse, pure in act, eloquent in speech; so that all who approach your house in order to invoke the Divine Master or to behold the excellence of the religious life, may be edified in beholding you and instructed in hearing you discourse or chant, and may return home rendering thanks to God most High.

'Fail not, as thou regardest our favour, to send a copy of this letter to all thy suffragans and to all the monasteries; and let no monk go beyond his monastery to administer justice or to enter the assemblies and the voting-places. Adieu.'[1]

Alcuin's hand discernible.

In this memorable capitulary, perhaps the most important document of the Middle Ages—'the charter of modern thought,' as one writer styles it[2]—it is not difficult to discern the true authorship. Among all the scholars then living, few, we apprehend, could have thus discoursed of the intimate correspondence between correct language and just thought (a foreshadowing, it would almost seem, of the scholastic estimate of the functions of logic), and of the importance of the allegorical element in the Scriptures; while the stipulation with respect to what may be termed the volitional element, as essential to success in teaching—in the requirement that the instructor shall be *desirous* of imparting knowledge[3]—points to one of the best features in the monastic theory of education.

This capitulary appears to have been issued on Charles' return from Augsburg, where he had just received the submission of the rebellious Tassilo. During his residence at

[1] *Constitutio de Scholis per singula Episcopia et Monasteria instituendis.* Baluze, i 201–4; Pertz, *Legg.* i 52–3.

[2] Ampère, iii 25.

[3] 'Et desiderium habeant alios instruendi.'

CHAP. I.

Charles obtains the services of teachers of singing, grammar, and arithmetic from Rome.

Council of Aachen, 789.

The Roman method of chanting enjoined.

Rome, in the preceding months, he had secured the services of teachers of singing, grammar, and arithmetic; and these were now sent to the principal different monasteries throughout the kingdom to render practical aid in carrying out the reforms indicated in the royal letter. Two years later, at the great council held at Aachen in 789, finding, it would seem, that his injunctions had not been sufficiently carried out, he issued more precise instructions. 'Let the monks,' said the new capitulary, 'make themselves thoroughly masters of the Roman method of chanting, and observe this method in the services, according to the decree of our father Pepin, who abolished the Gallican method, in order that he might place himself in agreement with the Apostolic see and promote concord in God's Church.'[1]

Defective state of MSS. at this period.

Among the most glaring results of the state of things which the emperor sought to remedy was the number of incorrectly transcribed copies of portions of the Scriptures, of breviaries and homilaries, scattered throughout the realm. Along with the general decline of learning, the monastic libraries had suffered greatly from neglect; while the loss of the papyrus, owing to the occupation of Egypt by the Saracens, had largely increased the costliness of the necessary material.

The sacred or patristic page, turned by rude unlettered hands, became mutilated or defaced. Transcripts became rarer; and ignorance, in its efforts to restore the text, already obscured by numerous and arbitrary contractions, doubtless often committed strange blunders; blunders such as afterwards gave rise to scarcely less ludicrous misapprehensions, on the part of half-informed modern writers, as to the actual state of learning in these times—to stories like those of the 'Benedic mulis et mulabis tuis' of bishop

[1] 'Quod beatae memoriae genitor noster Pippinus rex decertavit ut fieret, quando gallicanum cantum tulit ob unanimitatem Apostolicae Sedis et sanctae Dei Ecclesiae pacificam concordiam.' Baluze, i 715. In Ansegisus this is addressed to monastic bodies; Pertz (*Legg.* i 66) heads the article 'Omni Clero,' Baluze, 'Omnibus Clericis.' It was probably issued to both orders alike.

Meinwerc, the 'clam gram' of bishop Otto's clerk, and our own 'mumpsimus.'[1]

CHAP. I.

As a remedy for these evils Charles sent round to the churches a homilary, or collection of sermons, corrected by the hand of Paulus Diaconus (at that time probably engaged in teaching at Metz),[2] accompanied by the following instructions: 'Desirous as we are of improving the condition of the churches, we impose upon ourselves the task of reviving, with the utmost zeal, the study of letters, well-nigh extinguished through the neglect of our ancestors.[3] We charge all our subjects, as far as they may be able, to cultivate the liberal arts, and we set them the example. We have already, God helping, carefully corrected the books of the Old and New Testaments, corrupted through the ignorance of transcribers. And inasmuch as the collection of homilies for the service at nocturns was full of errors . . . we have willed that these same should be revised and corrected by Paul the deacon, our well-beloved client; and he has presented us with copies of readings, adapted to every feast day, carefully purged from error and sufficing for an entire year.'

Charles causes a corrected Homilary to be prepared for use in the services of the Church.

In the year 789,[4] another capitulary was circulated enforcing upon the clergy the necessity for raising their profession in public estimation by moral lives, and directing that candidates for the priestly office should be sought for *not only from among the servile class, but among the sons of freemen.*[5] Successive capitularies repeated and emphasised with greater distinctness the same injunctions. At a council at Aachen, in the same year, the standard for admission to orders was authoritatively fixed. The Capitulary of Frank-

Capitularies respecting the clergy.

[1] For a masterly exposure of these and similar exaggerations, see Maitland, *The Dark Ages*, Essay No. 8.

[2] *Encyclica de Emendatione Librorum et Officiorum Ecclesiasticorum* (Pertz, *Legg.* i 44; Baluze, i 204–5). If we accept the date assigned by Pertz to this capitular, i.e. 782, it would appear to have been among Charles' earliest measures of reform.

[3] 'Obliteratam pene majorum nostrorum desidia reparare vigilante studio litterarum satagimus officinam.' *Ib.*

[4] *Capitulare Aquisgranense.* Baluze, i 209–42.

[5] 'Non solum servilis conditionis infantes sed etiam ingenuorum filios aggregent sibique socient.'

CHAP. I.

fort in 794 is entirely taken up with regulations for the discipline of monastic bodies and the clergy. The latter are forbidden to enter taverns, and it is also required that no one shall be ordained a priest under thirty years of age.[1] In the instructions given to the *missi dominici* in 802, it is directed that their attention shall be given to canonical societies, to see that the rules of the order are observed.[2]

Capitulary of the year 789.

In a capitulary of 804 many of these instructions are again repeated. At the same time the actual work of education was strenuously pressed on. 'Let every monastery,' says the capitulary of 789, 'and every abbey *have its school*,[3] where boys may be taught the Psalms, the system of musical notation, singing, arithmetic, and grammar; and let the books which are given them be free from faults, and let care be taken that the boys do not spoil them either when reading or writing.'

Every monastery to have its school.

Of the manner in which the movement spread through the different dioceses and was aided by the episcopal order, we are presented with a notable example in Theodulfus, the famous bishop of Orleans. In the year 797, ten years after the appearance of the capitulary addressed by Charles to Baugulfus, Theodulfus drew up a similar document addressed to the clergy of his diocese. Apart from his ecclesiastical authority, his sentiments, as those of one of the *missi dominici*, would naturally carry great weight: we infer indeed that when Alcuin retired to Tours, in 796, Theodulfus succeeded him as a kind of minister of education, for the latter styles him 'the father of the vineyards,'[4] and the Orleans capitulary appears to have been widely adopted in other dioceses.[5]

Theodulfus: his capitulary to the clergy of his diocese.

He initiates a system of free education.

This document is remarkable as a combination of lofty sentiment and practical endeavour. St. Benedict himself could not have impeached the argument in justification of

[1] *Capitulare Frankfordiense.* Baluze, i 261–270.

[2] *Capitula data missis dominicis.* Ibid. i 360.

[3] 'Et ut scholae legentium puerorum fient.'

[4] 'Modo, miserante Deo, meliori populo secundus praeest David, et sub eo nobilior Zabdias cellis praeest vinearum.' Migne, c 394.

[5] See *Théodulfe, Evêque d'Orléans*, par M. l'Abbé Baunard. Paris, 1860.

study, as 'a means whereby the life of the righteous is nourished and ennobled, and the man himself fortified against temptation.' But the feature that has chiefly redeemed this document from oblivion is the clause wherein provision is made for *the gratuitous instruction of the children of the laity*. Theodulfus required his clergy to open schools in every town and village in the diocese, and to receive 'the children of the faithful' for instruction, demanding in return no payment, though permitted to accept a gift spontaneously offered.[1] Such is probably the earliest instance on record, in the history of Western Christianity, that answers to the free parish school of modern times.

We can scarcely doubt, with the foregoing evidence before us, that the work of reform, urged on by the strong will of Charles and directed by the experience of Alcuin, progressed with marvellous rapidity; and the facts already cited will enable us to form a fairly accurate estimate of the scope and nature of the work. It has been extravagantly extolled and it has also been unjustly depreciated. Gibbon, whose jealousy of every measure assignable to ecclesiastical influences led him to disparage the whole movement, has observed, with exaggerated antithesis, that 'the emperor strove to acquire the practice of writing, which every peasant now learns in his infancy.' An enthusiastic biographer of Alcuin, on the other hand, invites us to believe that 'there was a more universal education secured to the lower orders at the conclusion of the eighth century than France can boast of in the nineteenth.'[2] It is not difficult to see that the real truth lies somewhere between the theory advanced by the partiality of the professor and that implied by the prejudice of the historian.

Criticisms of Gibbon and Lorenz contrasted.

Of Alcuin's general success and satisfaction with the results of his labours there can be no reasonable doubt; and though the interval that separated Charles intellectually from

[1] 'Presbyteri per villas et vicos scholas habeant, et si quilibet fidelium suos parvulos ad discendas litteras eis commendare vult, eos suscipere non renuant, sed cum summa charitate eos doceant, etc.' Cossart, xiii 998.

[2] Lorenz, *Alcuin's Leben*, p. 38 (written 1829).

CHAP. I.

the ablest of his courtiers was considerable, yet it is certain that the circle of able men whom his discerning genius drew round him far surpassed in brilliancy that which surrounded Offa or Alfred the Great. But however little cause the court instructor might have to complain of apathy or insufficient support, we gather from more than one circumstance that he was beginning to grow somewhat weary of his position and his work. It is not difficult to see that the continual questioning and cross-questioning which he underwent in the Palace School often overtaxed both his patience and his resources. M. Monnier indeed inclines to the belief, that in the dialogue on grammar, of which an outline has been given, it was the design of the much-harassed instructor to exhibit, in the characters of the youthful Frank and the youthful Saxon, the kind of ordeal to which he had been subjected by his royal host.[1] There are certainly some passages which almost suggest that nothing but a sense of self-respect and of what was due to so august a presence, prevented Alcuin from turning on his merciless interrogator much in the fashion in which our great English lexicographer more than once resented the importunity which ultimately immortalised him. In Charles, the ardour of the student seems sometimes to have triumphed over the theory of *noblesse oblige*. He would suddenly bring forward, side by side, two explanations, wrung, at long intervals, from his instructor, and ask how *this* could be, and also *that*—when it needed no knowledge of art dialectical or any other art, in fact nothing but the light of nature, to see that the two statements were absolutely incompatible. The dignified ecclesiastic, accustomed to deliver his decisions at York unchallenged, winced sadly under this treatment. Long after, when he had effected his escape to Tours, and another teacher was enlightening the Palace School, he candidly admitted certain blunders, but suggests that they are to be condoned. 'The horse,' he says, 'which has four legs often

Circumstances that induce Alcuin to wish to retire from his post.

His ordeals in the Palace School.

[1] 'On peut dire qu'Alcuin a voulu représenter ainsi et les importunités de son principal élève, et les services d'instruction qu'il lui a rendus lui-même.' Monnier, p. 90.

stumbles; how much more must man, who has but one tongue, often trip in speech.'[1]

Frequent journeys.

Other sources of disquiet were not wanting. The frequent migrations of the Palace School, as it moved from Aachen to Thionville, from Thionville to Worms, and thence on to Mayence, Frankfort, or Ratisbon, were peculiarly irksome to one whose habits had been formed in the monotony of canonical life. And if to these journeys are added those to the abbeys committed to his charge (one in the Gâtinais, the other near Troyes),[2] we can easily enter into his complaint that his studies are sadly interrupted by secular business, long journeys, and the impossibility of carrying any large number of books with him on such occasions.[3] Then again there was the excitement that necessarily followed upon the setting forth of Charles and his generals to the seat of war, and upon their return. Since 782, not a year had elapsed that had not been marked by conflict within some portion or other of the Frankish boundaries; while the severity with which Charles treated the vanquished, especially the Saxons, completely shocked the gentle Alcuin, who, when safe at Tours, did not fail to plead for the extension of greater clemency. Even in the monarch's home life there must have been much which he could not fail to observe with pain and disapproval. For it was not a moral court, even when tried only by the standard of that age. Charles himself must often have scandalised the saintly ecclesiastic by those laxities which tarnish an otherwise heroic character. Then too there were the royal daughters, whom the foolish old father would not suffer to marry,[4] and who, breathing the atmo-

Excitement of successive wars.

Laxity of the court life.

[1] *Epist.* 84; Migne, c 27.

[2] '. . . et sic ad St. Lupum.' *Epist.* 66. 'Et inde ad sanctum Lupum, et ibi maxime spero me manere Septembrium mensem totum' . . . 'et sic Octobrio mense ad Ferrarias sanctum Petrum visitare, et ibi usque ad medium illum mensem spero me esse.' *Epist.* 67; Migne, c 255, 266. These letters belong to the year 798; but it is not probable that Alcuin would neglect to visit his abbeys during the earlier part of his residence in Frankland.

[3] *Præf. ad Genesin.* Migne, c 517.

[4] A policy which Dümmler, however, defends on political grounds. See *Gesch. d. Ostfränkischen Reichs*, p. 282.

CHAP. I.

sphere of a luxurious palace and taking pattern by his own sad example, might scarcely but go astray—the *coronatae columbae*,[1] as Alcuin terms them, when warning his countryman and successor Fredegis against their charms, and whom Lewis the Pious, on his accession, in his honest efforts to reform the court, sent packing to a nunnery.

He revisits England.

The attractions of a court rarely retain their fascination with men past middle life, and that Alcuin, whose education and former habits had been those of a recluse, should already have longed for retirement and repose can be small matter for surprise. A visit to England in the year 790 afforded the first respite from his labours. He had left his native land bound by solemn promise to return, and may even have contemplated making his return permanent. A small monastery on the banks of the Humber, founded by St. Willibrod, was his by inheritance, and he was still its nominal abbat. There were, however, circumstances which concurred to render his sojourn in England a somewhat anxious time. Mercia, under Offa's rule, had now reached the culminating point of her fortunes, and her relations with Frankland had, for some years past, been becoming less friendly. The Carolingian court was a harbour of refuge for her foes—for young Egbert, driven from his hereditary kingdom of Wessex by Offa's son-in-law Brihtric; and, at a later period, for Eadwulf, when defeated in his contest for the crown of Northumbria by another of Offa's sons-in-law, Ethelred. It was believed that a plot had been detected for calling in Frankish aid to the assistance of Kent in her struggle with her too powerful neighbour. A refusal on the part of Charles to permit his daughter Bertha to marry Offa's son had completed the rupture between the two courts.[2] Merchants trading between the two countries had already been warned that all intercourse was suspended, when Alcuin crossed the Channel.[3]

Disagreement between the Mercian and Frankish courts.

[1] 'Non veniant coronatae columbae ad fenestras tuas, quae volunt per cameras palatii.' *Epist.* 136; Migne, c 375.

[2] *Chron. Fontanell.* c. 15; Bouquet, *Scriptores*, v 315.

[3] 'Sed nescio quid nobis venturum sit. Aliquid enim dissensionis, diabolico fomento inflammante, nuper inter regem Carolum et regem Offam

CHAP. I.

It was at this juncture that he undertook to mediate between the two monarchs. The details of the negotiations have not reached us; but there appears to be good reason for believing that his practical good sense, together with the respect inspired by his character, mainly averted the calamity of war; and when, after an absence of nearly two years, he returned again to Frankland, he had added another claim to the gratitude of that country and its ruler.

War averted by Alcuin's efforts.

Events in England from this time offered small prospect of tranquil repose. The murder of Ethelbert, the pious king of the East Anglians, by Offa, and that of Osred, the exiled king of the Northumbrians, by Ethelred, indicate the disturbed state of the political atmosphere. In the following year, the year 793, to quote the language of the Chronicle, 'the ravaging of heathen men lamentably destroyed God's church at Lindisfarne,'[1] and northern England became the theatre of a continued series of rapine and slaughter. Bede's early home, St. Aidan's Holy Isle, were scenes of ruin and desolation. The Northumbrian exile, in the anguish of his heart, exclaimed that St. Cuthbert had forsaken his own; in his dismay, he took up the strain chanted two centuries before in Italy by Gregory, and was fain to interpret the appalling anarchy and misery that prevailed as the fulfilment of Daniel's prophecy and ominous of the approaching end of all things!

Subsequent events in England.

It was at Charles' earnest request that Alcuin returned to Frankland—a request urged under circumstances that, to the latter, probably seemed to render his acquiescence little less than an imperative duty. Heresy was shewing a bold front in the Frankish dominions. The Adoptionists, headed by the Spanish bishops, Felix and Elipandus, were occasioning grave anxiety to the orthodox party; while the dispute respecting the eastern practice of image worship represented

The Carolines.

exortum est, ita ut utrinque navigatio interdicta negotiantibus cesset. Sunt qui dicunt, nos pro pace in illas partes mittendos.' *Ad Colcum lectorem in Scotia.* Migne, ci 142.

[1] *English Chronicle*, sub anno. 'Locus cunctis in Brittannia venerabilior, paganis gentibus datur ad depredandum,' is Alcuin's comment. *Alcuin.*, p. 181.

CHAP. I.

a yet more pressing difficulty. Of Alcuin's right to be regarded as the author of the Carolines—that memorable effort of Iconoclasm—there can be little doubt.[1] Idolatry in its grosser and tangible forms was always an object of his severest denunciations; and if some difficulty is presented in the fact that one possessed by such deep reverence for the papal authority should have ventured to contravene the decrees of Adrian and to assert with so much boldness the theory of conciliar independence, an explanation may be found in the supposition that the Carolines are the offspring not only of Alcuin's learning and literary skill, but also of Charles' vigorous thought and policy. The signal honour conferred, as we have already seen, on the former at the Council of Frankfort, proves that throughout its proceedings he was the ready and willing interpreter of the royal pleasure.

Alcuin receives the abbacy of St. Martin of Tours.

The year 794 may be looked upon as marking the time when Alcuin's reputation was at its highest. His fame was 'in all the Churches;' and few could have been found to call in question his signal services to both religion and learning or his just claim to distinguished reward. As yet, however, no adequate recompense had been vouchsafed him. His own avowal, indeed, is that no hope of worldly advantage, but a simple sense of duty to the Church, had originally brought him to Frankland and detained him there. On the other hand, it is almost certain that, in resigning his office as *scholasticus* at York, he had sacrificed his succession to the archbishopric. It is not improbable, therefore, that Charles had already intimated that on the next vacancy in the abbacy of St. Martin of Tours the post would be offered to Alcuin. The latter, writing to the brethren of that venerable society in 795, openly confesses that he would gladly be of their number;[2] and the opportunity arrived sooner perhaps than he anticipated, for in the following year the abbat Itherius died, and Alcuin was forthwith nominated his successor.

[1] Frobenius considered that the style of the Carolines was that of another pen than Alcuin's; but see Dümmler's note, p. 220.

[2] 'Optans unus esse ex vobis.' *Epist.* 23; Migne, c 176.

CHAPTER II.

ALCUIN AT TOURS; OR, THE SCHOOL OF THE MONASTERY.

CHAP. II.

THE transfer of Alcuin from the Palace School to the abbacy at Tours was attended by results of no slight importance. On the one hand, it enabled him to give full and practical expression to his theory of monastic discipline and education; on the other, it opened up the way for the introduction of other teachers at the royal court, some of whom, as we shall hereafter see, held doctrines little in harmony with those of their predecessor.

The abbey of St. Martin of Tours.

Of his real sense of relief and satisfaction with his new sphere of duty there can be no doubt. He had received what was, perhaps, the most marked recognition of his services that it was in Charles' power to bestow. Already the abbey was the wealthiest in Frankland, and the adjacent cathedral the most splendid of all her shrines. In days gone by, Tours and Poitiers had contended fiercely for the relics of St. Martin;[1] the coveted prize had fallen to the former city, and its possession thenceforth appealed with singular force to the superstition of the time. Neither St. Remy nor St. Denys, as yet, could vie in saintly fame with the venerated founder of monasticism in Gaul. Tours rivalled Rome itself as a centre of religious pilgrimage; both monastery and cathedral were lavishly enriched by the devout munificence of the Carolingian princes; and long after, when Hugh Capet sat on the throne of Charles the Great, he wore the ecclesiastical cope which bespoke him the abbat of St. Martin of Tours. The landed possessions of the monastery were immense, fully equalling in extent an average modern

[1] Gregory of Tours, *Hist. Franc.* IV XXXIV.

CHAP. II.

department; the archbishop of Toledo made it a reproach to Alcuin, that he was the master of 20,000 slaves.[1]

Alcuin's aims and sentiments as abbat.

With resources like these, it might well seem that the guardian of the interests and traditions of the faith might find full scope for every purpose. Here learning, treading ever in the safe and narrow path marked out by Gregory and Bede, might marshal illustrious recruits destined to bear her banners throughout the length and breadth of Charles' vast domains. Here, on the banks of the rushing Loire, the life of which St. Benedict drew the outlines might be lived again in all its purity and power. Here, on the boundary line 'twixt docile Neustria and half-tamed Aquitaine, religion might win new converts and achieve a conquest with which those of Charles Martel or his greater grandson might not compare!

His increasing austerity in relation to classical literature.

Such, as there is sufficient evidence to shew, were the aims of Alcuin's ambition, as he looked forward to the crowning work of his career. His theory of education had not expanded with enlarged experience. No visions of science, spreading and developing in the coming years, gilded the sunset of his days. Something rather of self-reproach is discernible in his correspondence for so much time and labour already wasted on secular knowledge. Vergil, whom he had studied with loving ardour as a boy, now seemed to him only a collection of 'lying fables' unfit to be read by those devoted to the religious life. 'The sacred poets are enough for you,' he said to the young monks at Tours; 'you have no need to sully your minds with the rank luxuriance of Vergil's verse.'[2] He rebuked even his friend Rigbodus for knowing the twelve books of the Aeneid better than the four Evangelists.[3] When Charles wrote to ply him with questions upon some new difficulties, he could not forbear, in his reply, from mildly expressing his surprise that 'his dearest David' should wish to involve him again in 'those

[1] See Monnier's interesting sketch, 'Un abbé seigneur au huitième siècle,' in his *Charlemagne et Alcuin*, pt. iii, c. 4.

[2] 'Sufficiunt divini poetae vobis, nec egetis luxuriosa sermonis Virgilii vos pollui facundia.' *Alcuini Vita*, c. 19; Migne, c 101.

[3] 'Utinam evangelica quattuor non Aeneades duodecim pectus compleant tuum.' *Epist.* 215, *Alcuiniana*, p. 4.

old questions of the Palace School, and to summon back to the contending camps, and to the task of quieting the minds of the mutinous soldiery, the veteran who had served his time;' 'especially,' he adds, 'as you have by you the tomes both of secular learning and of the Church's wisdom, wherein the true answers may be found to all your queries.'[1]

His measures of reform.

/Something of the enthusiasm of his early days came back to the weary old man as he welcomed at St. Martin the youthful neophytes who, attracted by his fame, came seeking admission within the abbey walls. His first aim was to provide them with a good library, such a library as he had himself watched over at York; and we accordingly find him writing to Charles, soon after his installation, to beg that he may be allowed to send some of the young monks to England, who might 'bring back to France the flowers of Britain,' 'so that these may diffuse their fragrance and display their colours at Tours as well as at York.'[2] 'In the morning of my life,' he says, in the same letter, 'I sowed in Britain; and now, in the evening of that life, when my blood begins to chill, I cease not to sow in France, earnestly praying that, by God's grace, the seed may spring up in both lands.[3] As for my own frail frame, I solace myself with the thought to which St. Jerome, when writing to Nepotianus, gives expression; and reflect that *all* the powers might well decline with old age, but that, although the rest wane, wisdom augments in strength.'/ What books his deputies brought back from York we have no evidence to shew, but we may safely assume that the collection did not include a copy of Martianus Capella.

His letter to Charles.

The reputation of the monastery of St. Martin in former times harmonised well with Alcuin's design of making it a model for the religious life and discipline throughout Frankland. It had once been famous for both its learning and its austere rule. Sulpicius Severus, in his life of the founder, tells us that even the greatest cities preferred that their superior clergy should be recruited from those who had been

[1] *Epist.* 82; Migne, c 266. [2] *Epist.* 43; Migne, c 208.

[3] 'Mane florentibus per aetatem studiis seminavi in Britannia. Nunc vero frigescente sanguine quasi vespere in Francia seminare non cesso. Utraque enim, Dei gratia donante, oriri optans.' Ibid. c 209.

CHAP. II.

educated at St. Martin;[1] and its aristocratic associations are probably indicated by the fact that its members, in their leisure hours, confined themselves entirely to the scholarly labours of the *scriptorium*. Even this occupation, however, was discarded by the older monks, who devoted themselves solely to prayer.[2]

His representations to Charles somewhat at variance with his actual discipline.

There is good reason for concluding that, in the interpretation given by Alcuin to the Benedictine rule, the classic authors—whose names occupy so prominent a place in his description of the library at York—were almost entirely forbidden, at least to the younger monks. It is true that, in the letter to Charles[3] above quoted, he says, that, 'in compliance with the royal instructions and good pleasure,' he shall give to some 'the honey of the sacred writings,' 'shall gladden others with the vintage of the ancient learning,' and mete out to others 'the apples of grammatical subtlety;' but it appears not improbable that he concealed, to some extent, from his royal patron those severer canons which closed to the junior students at St. Martin the page of pagan fancy and legend. It is certain, at any rate, that an incident recorded by Alcuin's unknown biographer clashes somewhat with the foregoing representations. Sigulfus, along with two others of the younger monks—Aldricus and Adalbert, afterwards abbat of Ferrières—endeavoured, notwithstanding the formal prohibition, to carry on the study of Vergil unknown to the abbat. They believed that they had effectually guarded against detection; but one day Sigulfus received a summons to Alcuin's presence. 'How is this Vergilian,' said the abbat, 'that unknown to me, and contrary to my express command, thou hast begun to study Vergil?' The astonished monk threw himself at his superior's feet, and promised from that day forth to study Vergil no more.[4] He was dismissed with a severe reprimand; and

Story told of Sigulfus.

[1] 'Quae enim esset civitas aut ecclesia, quae non sibi de Martini monasterio cuperet sacerdotem?' Sulp. Sev. *Vita S. Martini*, Migne, xx 166.

[2] 'Ars ibi, exceptis scriptoribus, nulla habebatur; cui tamen operi minor aetas deputabatur; majores orationi vacabant.' Ibid.

[3] *Epist.* 43; Migne, c 208.

[4] *Alcuini Vita*, Migne, c 101.

it may be inferred that all three laid the lesson well to heart, for two of the number lived to merit and receive Alcuin's warmest approval and praise.[1]

Alcuin's general discipline.

Over the whole discipline of the monastery Alcuin watched with untiring vigilance. The points on which he especially insisted were, a stricter observance of the Benedictine rule and the cultivation of sacred learning. He was unceasing in his exhortations to nightly vigils, to humility, obedience, and chastity. Verses full of wise precepts were suspended in the refectory and the dormitories. He gave careful supervision to the work of the transcribers,[2] whose art would appear to have sadly degenerated. Writing to Charles, in the year 800, he complains that the use of full-points, and, in fact, punctuation generally, had become almost entirely neglected. He hoped, however, to effect a reform in this as in other matters: 'licet parum proficiens,' he says, 'cum Turonica quotidie pugno rusticitate.'[3]

Numerous students from England.

Envy of the Neustrians.

The fame of his teaching attracted disciples not only from all Frankland, but even from across the Channel. From England they came in such numbers as to excite the jealousy of the Neustrians. One day an Anglo-Saxon priest[4] knocked at the gate of the monastery, and while he waited without, his appearance and dress were eyed by four of the monks who were standing by. They imagined, says the narrator, that he would not understand their speech, and he overheard one of them say, 'Here is another Briton or Irishman come to see the Briton inside. The Lord deliver this monastery from these British, for they swarm hither like bees to their hive!'

[1] Of Sigulfus Alcuin says that he was 'sacrae lectionis studiosissimus;' of Adalbert, 'bonam habuit voluntatem et humilitatem, seu in servitio Dei, seu etiam in lectionis studio.' *Alcuini Vita; Praef. in Genesin*, Migne, c 516; see also letter to Arno, c 295.

[2] 'Pour transcrire les manuscrits, l'abbé de Tours mit en usage le petit caractère romain, plus beau et plus lisible que la pesante écriture des Mérovingiens: c'est ce qu'on appelle l'*écriture caroline*.' Monnier, p. 243.

[3] Migne, c 315.

[4] 'Presbyter Engel-Saxo.' Ib. c 102. An apparent exception to the rule laid down by Mr. Freeman—that 'the name by which our forefathers really knew themselves and by which they were known to other nations was "English" *and no other*.' Norman Conquest, i 536 (2nd edit.).

CHAP. II.

Alcuin's preference for his own countrymen.

It is not improbable that this jealousy was to some extent stimulated by the preference which, either from expediency or inclination, Alcuin evidently entertained for his own countrymen. It was Witzo, one of his companions from York to Aachen, who taught for a time as his approved successor in the Palace School. Fredegis, who had also been educated at York, afterwards succeeded to the same post and was abbat, after Alcuin, at Tours. Liudger, a native indeed of Friesland, but one of Alcuin's scholars in England, was raised by Charles, at his former instructor's suggestion, to preside over the newly created see of Münster. Sigulfus, the disciple most honoured by Alcuin's confidence, was his chosen successor at Ferrières. The impression that we thus derive, of a certain amount of national prejudice on Alcuin's part, serves to illustrate the difference between his character and that of Charles. The latter in no way shared the feeling with which the young Neustrians at Tours regarded the new-comers from beyond the seas. To quote the expression of Einhard, 'he loved the foreigner,'—exhibiting, in a marked degree, a characteristic rarely absent from administrative genius of the highest order, the passion *for studying the dissimilar*.

Difference in this respect between him and Charles.

But just as it was to this feature in Charles' character that Alcuin, in common with many of his countrymen, was indebted for his cordial reception at the Frankish court, so, not long after his retirement to Tours, the same tendency, on the part of his royal patron, began to manifest itself in a manner that occasioned him no small anxiety. The sympathy which welcomed the Anglo-Saxon could also extend itself to the Scot; the enquiring intellect which listened with so much eagerness to the teaching of the school at York, was not content to ignore, as mysteriously heterodox, the ancient doctrine of Lindisfarne; and thus there now ensued an episode in the history of the Palace School which requires that we should turn aside for a moment from our main narrative, to note some of the most remarkable features in the history of a memorable though almost forgotten movement.

We have already adverted to the fact that a very different

school of theology from that of Boniface and Alcuin had been represented in Frankland in the person of Columban.[1] So far as it is possible to discern the facts in a singularly obscure period, it would appear probable that the better influences of Cassian's teaching, as preserved and transmitted by the *Insulani*, had found their way to the monasteries of Ireland. In striking contrast to the fate that overtook the great foundations in Frankland, these monasteries were equally distinguished by their material prosperity and their devotion to letters; and the writers of the age often allude with enthusiasm to the one land where the Church achieved a durable conquest unaided by the civil arm and unstained by the effusion of blood. To their fancy it resembled the mythic region of the Hesperides, a land shrouded in a halo of blissful repose, whence the baneful influences of the seasons and all that could molest or harm were repelled by some guardian power.[2] The Irish monks themselves cherished this conception, and the rude stanzas chanted by the monks of Banchor still exist, wherein they liken their monastery to a ship, rudely tossed at times by the waves without, but peaceful and secure within.[3]

The Irish monasteries in the sixth and seventh centuries.

To the Frank the traditions of this distant land could appeal for an impartial audience with far better prospects of success than to the leaders of religious policy in England, and already in the person of Columban had gained a brilliant though evanescent triumph. Long before St. Boniface set foot in Thuringia, before even St. Augustine landed in Kent, Columban had set forth from Ulster, to found on the frontier of Austrasia, amid the mountains of the Vosges, the monastery of Luxeuil—famous in the seventh century for its learning when learning in Frankland was dead. From thence he had issued forth to rebuke the vices of the Burgundian court; and from thence, after a retirement of twelve years, had

Columban's successes in Frankland.

[1] See supra, p. 41.

[2] Bede, *Eccles. Hist.* I i.

[3] Benchuir bona regula
Recta atque divina . . .
Navis nunquam turbata,
Quamvis fluctibus tonsa.
Muratori *Anecd.* (quoted by Ozanam, p. 101).

CHAP. II.

Controversy between the Celtic and Latin Churches.

been summoned before a synod of Frankish bishops to answer for his Celtic heresy with regard to the observance of Easter. In the isolation of their island home, the Irish theologians still maintained the more ancient method of observing Easter, according to a cycle of 84 years. They knew nothing, or professed to know nothing, of the cycle of Victorius, published in the year 457, and afterwards accepted, through the labours of Dionysius Exiguus, by almost the entire Latin Church. In the estimation of the English ecclesiastic the question had in no way declined in importance, since the time when it formed the foremost subject of discussion at Whitby. To Bede it appeared a cardinal article of faith—a kind of thirteenth commandment. He tells us of Theodorus, that he 'taught the right rule of life—*and* the canonical method of celebrating Easter;' Eanfleda, feasting and keeping Palm Sunday, while Oswy still fasted, seemed to him a grievous scandal.[1] In Alcuin's view the question wore an equally grave aspect; neither the Adoptionist theory on the one hand, nor the question of Image Worship on the other, could divert his attention from this sad heresy. It presented, in fact, an insuperable difficulty in every attempt to reconcile the Celtic and the Latin Church.

The light in which such controversies present themselves in history.

The ordinary observer, on a superficial glance, is apt to dismiss such controversies with an expression of pitying contempt. He sees in them nothing more than another proof of the puerility of the mediaeval mind and of the perverse tendencies of theological thought. A wider acquaintance with history and a closer study of its phenomena can hardly, however, fail to modify an estimate so flattering to modern self-complacency. Without recalling the fact that even in the present age, separated as it is from that of Alcuin by the experiences and research of twelve centuries, disputes concerning the lighting of candles and the colours of vestments are still troubling alike the statesman, the churchman and the theologian—we may observe that a very cursory investigation will suffice to shew that the questions that have divided Christendom from the second to the nineteenth cen-

[1] *Eccles. Hist.* IV ii; and III XXV.

tury have rarely been of supreme doctrinal importance. The contests between religious parties often indeed remind us of what may be witnessed in military warfare. A small town, an insignificant fort, owing to a series of strategic movements, suddenly becomes a point of the highest value. It represents the key to a position which the assailing party is bound at any cost to carry, the defending party at any cost to hold. Few, however, are so ignorant as to suppose that either of the contending forces would be ready to expend so large an amount of blood and treasure, were the loss or gain of the position itself the sole result in prospect. It is the same in theological controversy. A minor point of doctrine has often been the ground whereon two great parties have agreed to try their strength, but behind a comparatively unimportant tenet we may generally discern broad and essential principles contending for the mastery. It was so in Alcuin's day. The Celtic and the Latin Church differed in their hierarchical principles, in the cast of their whole theology, as well as concerning the fashion of the tonsure, the rite of baptism, and the observance of Easter. The submission so readily yielded by the king of the Franks and the teachers at York to the authority of Rome was refused by the Irish theologian. St. Columban, when rebuking the pretensions of Boniface VIII, declared that he and his countrymen were the disciples of St. Peter and St. Paul, who had written under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and had acknowledged only that primitive apostolic teaching of which Rome from the earliest times had been divinely designed to be the conservator.[1] It is well known how the learned Ussher, under the combined influence of political and theological sympathies, was thus led to claim for the ancient Irish Church a purely Protestant character—a theory maintained even by so recent and well-informed a writer as Thierry.[2]

Other points of divergence between the Celtic and the Latin clergy.

Denial by the former of the authority of Rome.

It was in keeping with this repudiation of the autocracy

[1] See Columban's Letter *ad Bonifacium Papam*, Migne, lxxx 274.

[2] Ussher, *De Christianarum Ecclesiarum successione et statu*, pp. 13–21; Thierry, *Hist. de la Conquête d'Angleterre*, i 324.

CHAP. II.

Resemblance between the Celtic and the Eastern theological spirit.

of Rome, that the theologian of the Irish monasteries looked with especial favour and admiration upon the writings of the Greek Fathers. Able writers on this period have discerned much in common between the Hellenic and the Celtic minds,—'a certain speculative uplooking quality,'[1] certainly not very apparent in the writers of the school of York. A further resemblance, and one of a less promising character, may be traced in the predilection shewn by both for questions which admitted a display of dialectical subtlety. It was this feature which especially arrested the notice of Benedict of Aniane and aroused his dislike for the Irish theologians. They were distinguished, he tells us, by their fondness for syllogistic mystification.[2] They would often amuse themselves by interrogating some stolid representative of orthodoxy, and compel him, as the logical sequence of his own replies, to admit the existence of three Gods or to disavow his belief in the Trinity. The same tendency led them to admire in Martianus Capella those speculations which rendered his volume a sealed book to the scholars of York; while in the three great monasteries that marked the route of St. Columban's apostolate—Luxeuil, St. Gall, and Bobbio—numerous manuscripts, in the elegant Irish character (*Scottice scripta*), of Origen and other Greek fathers, long remained to attest the more enquiring spirit in which the studies of their communities were pursued.

Other differences, of a more specific character, excited the jealousy and distrust of the Latin clergy. The Irish theologian did not concur in their condemnation and neglect of classic literature; he was not unfrequently acquainted to some extent with Greek; he used a Latin version of the New Testament that was not the Vulgate and which claimed to be anterior to Jerome; his text-book of elementary instruc-

[1] Maurice, *Mediaeval Philosophy*, p. 32. 'Le génie celtique, qui est celui de l'individualité, sympathise profondément avec le génie grec.' Michelet, *Hist. de France*, i 121. Compare Alcuin's observation on the Irish scholars of his day: 'minus illis videtur, auctoritate et consuetudine sola esse responsum, nisi et aliqua ratio addatur auctoritate.' Migne, c 260.

[2] 'Apud modernos scholasticos maxime apud Scotos iste syllogismus delusionis.' Baluze, *Miscellanea*, v 54.

tion was more often than not the dangerously speculative treatise of Martianus Capella.

It was from the pages of this writer that Virgilius, the Irish bishop of Salzburg, drew his theory of the existence of an Antipodes,—a doctrine which seems to have especially alarmed the earnest but intolerant Boniface and evoked the anathema of pope Zacharias.[1] The eminent reformer, while he saw still stretching before him almost limitless tracts abandoned to pagan belief and superstition and appealing to Christian philanthropy, had small patience for vague and unsettling speculation. When one of the Irish clergy, named Clement, ventured to broach certain strange notions concerning predestination, Carloman, the brother of Pepin le Bref, at Boniface's advice, sent the heretic to prison;[2] and the injunction which the reformer obtained from Gregory III against not only *gentilitatis ritum et doctrinam*, but also those *venientium Britonum*,[3] is additional evidence of his unmistakeable hostility to the teaching of this school. That hostility, it need scarcely be added, became a tradition from Boniface's time with Alcuin and nearly all the Latin clergy. One alone, perhaps, in the whole Frankish court, could survey these differences with impartiality, and that one was the monarch himself. There is good reason indeed for inferring that he entertained a genuine and lively curiosity respecting the Irish clergy. The necessity of defending their mode of observing Easter from the objections of their antagonists, had led them to devote particular attention to the subject of astronomy, and the Irish theologian thus became the better astronomer as well as the better dialectician. It was Charles'

Boniface and the Irish clergy.

Astronomical knowledge possessed by the latter.

[1] 'De perversa autem et iniqua doctrina, quæ contra Deum et animam suam locutus est—si clarificatum fuerit, ita eum confiteri; quod alius mundus et alii homines sub terra sint seu sol et luna—hunc, habito concilio, ab ecclesia pelle, sacerdotii honore privatum.' Jaffé, *Mon. Mogunt.*, p. 191. Zach. to Boniface.

[2] Milman, ii 302; Clement and another heretic are here styled 'duos haereticos publicos et pessimos et blasphemos contra Deum et contra catholicam fidem.' The heresies of Clement appear to have included the rejection of the authority of Jerome, Augustine, and Gregory. See Jaffé, *Mon. Mogunt.*, p. 140.

[3] *Epist.* 4; Migne, xxxix 580.

CHAP. II.

special delight to study the movements of the heavenly bodies; and we learn from Einhard that he expended no small time and labour in extracting from Alcuin all that the latter could communicate.[1] This, as we have already seen, could have been but little, and Charles' sagacity could scarcely have failed to suggest that it was but a mockery of science when he was told, by way of explanation of the prolonged disappearance of Mars from the heavens, that the planet had been detained by the sun, which had again at last let it go through fear of the Nemean lion; or when he was assured that a comet of singular brightness was probably the soul of Liudger, just then recently deceased!

Charles' interest in astronomical questions.

His relations with Ireland.

That the scholars of Ireland were well known to Charles by report admits of little doubt. His relations with their native country were eminently friendly, the Irish kings, according to Einhard, styling themselves 'his subjects and slaves;'[2] while young Egbert, who was at this time his guest, and the boundaries of whose hereditary kingdom extended to that part of Cornwall known as West Wales, where a Celtic population maintained its ground and preserved frequent intercourse with the Holy Island,[3] would hardly fail to tell his royal host something concerning the famous Irish monasteries.[4]

We can thus readily understand how it was that when

[1] 'Apud quem . . . praecipue astronomiae ediscendae plurimum et temporis et laboris impertivit.' *Caroli Vita*, c. 25. Echoed by the poet Saxo

'A quo precipue studuit totam rationem
Et legem cursus noscere siderei.'—Pertz, i 271.

[2] 'Scotorum quoque reges sic habuit ad suam voluntatem per munificentiam inclinatos, ut eum nunquam aliter nisi dominum, seque subditos et servos ejus pronuntiarent.' *Caroli Vita*, c. 16; *Carolina*, 523.

[3] The close similarity of the stone crosses of Ireland to those of Cornwall is an interesting illustration of this intercourse. See Rimmer's *Ancient Stone Crosses of England*, pp. 10, 11.

[4] Considerations like these seem to justify our rejection of a theory of Clement and his followers 'dropping as it were from the clouds upon the benighted Continent' (Haddan, *Remains*, p. 281), as derived from the improbable story of the *Monachus Sangallensis* (Pertz, ii 371), though the story has been accepted by such able enquirers as Mr. Haddan, M. Ozanam, and Dr. Lanigan. Chateaubriand long ago justly observed that the Monk of St. Gall is the father of the fabulous element relating to Charles.

another Clement, known as Clement of Ireland, accompanied by one or two companions, presented himself at the hospitable court, he was cordially welcomed; that the monarch was delighted with the readiness and clearness with which the new-comers responded to his questions; and that, as the final result, the heterodox Clement was installed in the chair once filled by Alcuin. This important change appears to have taken place within two years after Alcuin's retirement to Tours. The discipline of the monastery was already beginning to assume a character more consonant with his views, and the 'Turonese rusticity' to disappear before his continuous efforts. We gather something of a feeling of chagrin at the forgetfulness shewn by his court friends, but he consoled himself with the thought that in the Palace School his teaching was sustained by Witzo and Fredegis, and was thankful to have gained the repose he sought. We can hardly be surprised that the news of the installation of Clement proved a severe shock to his mental tranquillity.

He welcomes Clement of Ireland at Aachen, and appoints him head of the Palace School.

He appears first to have become apprised of the change through a correspondence with Charles himself. The latter had recently been writing to Alcuin for explanations respecting certain celestial phenomena by which he was somewhat perplexed, and had submitted the replies he had received to the Irish scholars just recently arrived at Aachen. Their criticisms only added still further to his perplexity, and in the sequel, after a long silence, he wrote again to Alcuin, restating his difficulties and soliciting further explanations. So far as we can judge from the facts, it seems unquestionable that Clement and his colleagues shewed a decided superiority in scientific knowledge; and Charles' letters, which unfortunately have not come down to us, seem to have wounded Alcuin's self-esteem very nearly. In a notable reply, more pathetic than dignified, he betrays his sense of injured merit and recalls his past services. He is like Entellus (the poor old man could not forget his Vergil) summoned again to put on the caestus with a young and vigorous Dares. 'Simpleton that I was and ignorant,' he goes on to say, 'little dreaming

Alcuin's discomfiture.

CHAP. II.

that the school of the Egyptians[1] had gained an entrance into David's glorious palace. When I went away, I left the Latins there; I know not who introduced the Egyptians. It is not so much that I have been ignorant of the Memphian method of calculation, as attached to the Roman custom; for I long ago entered the land of promise and left the Egyptian darkness behind.'[2] Charles, it would seem, was desirous of seeing his former instructor confronted with his critics, and perhaps promised himself no little entertainment from the encounter. Though far away, engaged in punishing the Saxons on the other side of the Elbe for the murder of some of his ambassadors, he wanted Alcuin to come to him. Alcuin is alarmed at the very notion. *Quid valet infirmitas Flacci inter arma? quid inter apros lepusculus?* At the close of his letter Charles had suggested, that should Alcuin discover anything erroneous in his former expositions, he hoped he would condescend to correct it. Alcuin discerns in this suggestion an implied censure, and hastens to vindicate himself. Never, he warmly asserts, has he been so tenacious of his errors or confident of his powers, as to be unwilling to retract his first opinion when better advised.

Alarm of the orthodox party.

It is evident indeed that he was deeply pained, and, in fact, the intelligence must have been heard with something like consternation by every supporter of orthodoxy in Gaul. It sent a shudder though Benedict in his cell on the distant Aniane; it startled even the astute Theodulfus in his episcopal palace at Orleans. The latter had long been distinguished as a strenuous opponent of the Irish school of theology. There are still extant some verses addressed by

[1] In allusion to a difference in the method of the Alexandrian astronomers. So in Bede (III xxv) Anatolius is said by Wilfrid to have computed 'according to the custom of the Egyptians.' 'Annum autem civilem id est solarem . . . Aegyptii ab autumno, a brumi incipiunt Romani.' Bede, *De temporum ratione* (quoted by Dümmler, *Alcuiniana*, p. 408).

[2] 'Et ut ad rem veniam, ac ignorantiae fomentis caput percussi medicari incipiam: ego imperitus, ego ignarus, resciens Aegyptiacam scholam in palatio Davidicae versari gloriae: ego abiens Latinos ibi dimisi. Nescio quis introduxit Aegyptios. Nec tam indoctus fui Memphiticae supputationis quam benevolus Romanae consuetudinis.' Migne, c 266. The passage has been ludicrously misunderstood by Ampère, iii 27.

him to Charles in the year in which Alcuin retired to Tours, and written not improbably with the design of averting the very event above recorded. In these he inveighs with peculiar bitterness against the *Scottellus*. The Irish theologian is stigmatised as 'a lawless thing,' 'a deadly foe,' 'a dull horror,' 'a malignant pest,' '*one who, though versed in many subjects, knows nothing for certain or true*, and even in subjects of which he is ignorant fancies himself omniscient.'[1]

Charles, however, was not one to be diverted from his designs by a mere outbreak of theological jealousy, and the Irish school would appear to have made good their footing in the palace for the greater part of the ninth century. The more immediate result was, that Alcuin found himself involved in a heavy astronomical correspondence, in which he labours painfully to explain more to the satisfaction of his royal patron the various celestial phenomena, and especially the changes of the moon.[2] Charles, in return, shewed himself not indifferent to his old instructor's feelings, and, a few months later, we find him sending Fredegis to Tours with presents, which Alcuin gratefully acknowledged. Perhaps he began to think that it would not be a matter of regret if Charles' thoughts could be diverted into another channel, for in the same letter he takes occasion to urge the necessity for the speedy suppression of the Adoptionists.[3]

Alcuin's further correspondence with Charles.

The refutation of Felix, bishop of Urgel, the leading representative of this sect, was the concluding triumph in Alcuin's career. In the year 800, Charles visited St. Martin's shrine at Tours, and on his departure was accompanied by Alcuin.[4] They proceeded by Orleans and Paris to Aachen, where, in the king's presence, together with that of numerous dignitaries of the Church, Alcuin held what he

His triumph over the Adoptionists.

[1] Migne, cv 322.

[2] See *Epist.* 98 to 112 in *Alcuiniana;* Dümmler's arrangement of this portion of Alcuin's correspondence is a valuable correction of the confusion introduced by the old arrangement of Frobenius, and I have accordingly here given the references to his volume.

[3] *Alcuiniana*, p. 420.

[4] Pertz, i 117; see also Dümmler's notes in *Alcuiniana* to *Epist.* 132, 133, 147.

CHAP. II.

himself styles 'a great dispute' (*magnam contentionem*) with Felix.[1] Here he was far more in his element than he would have been when arguing points of astronomical science with Clement of Ireland, and Felix eventually confessed himself completely vanquished. From this time we may date the gradual disappearance of the Adoptionist party, at least so far as known under their distinctive appellation.

Somewhat earlier in the same year, Liutgarda, Charles' best-loved wife, in whose esteem Alcuin had always held a foremost place, died while on a visit to Tours, and was interred in the splendid cathedral. The letter which Alcuin addressed to the royal widower on the occasion is still extant.[2] Liutgarda's death in no way diminished Charles' regard for one whom she had so highly honoured, and when, towards the close of the year, he was preparing for his last visit to Rome, he strongly urged that Alcuin should accompany him. The latter, however, who had recently been attacked by fever, shrank from the risks and toils of such a journey; he preferred, he said, the smoky roofs of Tours to the gilded splendour of Rome, involved as the great city then was in domestic discord.[3] Alcuin accordingly was not a spectator of the famous event, when the imperial crown was placed on the head of Charles, and the monarch rose up, no longer *Patricius*, but *Imperator et Augustus*.[4] On Charles' return to Frankland, the abbat of Tours sent Candidus to meet him, and penned a letter of congratulation;[5] but there is no evidence that he at all adequately grasped the significance of an event fraught with momentous consequences in relation to European history.

He declines to accompany Charles to Rome.

He congratulates him on his accession to the imperial dignity.

In the following year we find him dedicating his Commentary on the Gospel of St. John to Gisla and Rotruda, Charles' sister and daughter.[6] In the year ensuing, the

[1] 'Cum Felice heretico magnam contentionem in praesentia domni regis et sanctorum patrum habuimus.' Pertz, i 187; see also Dümmler's notes in *Alcuiniana* to *Epist.* 132, 133, 147.

[2] *Epist.* 138 (ed. Dümmler).

[3] *Epist.* 119: ibid. p. 487.

[4] Pertz, i 189.

[5] *Alcuiniana, Epist.* 159 and 170.

[6] Ibid. *Epist.* 158.

letters given by the emperor to his *missi dominici* shew that his efforts for the improvement of the people were not diminished,[1] though Alcuin was no longer at his side. Among the newly created *missi* was Theodulfus, hitherto Alcuin's cordial friend, but whom an unfortunate event soon after alienated, while in Lorenz's opinion it hastened Alcuin's end. A monk, already condemned by justice, had escaped from prison and taken refuge in the sanctuary of St. Martin of Tours. Over this, as the church of the monastery, Alcuin held jurisdiction. The monk was pursued by the soldiery of Theodulfus, from whose custody he had effected his escape. Their unceremonious entrance into the venerated edifice aroused the susceptibilities of the citizens of Tours, and an alarming collision ensued, which was only terminated by the intervention of Alcuin. In some manner, which is not altogether clear, the exercise of his authority excited not only the anger of Theodulfus, but the displeasure of Charles himself. It was probably the old question between monastic immunities and episcopal and civil rights. The letter addressed by Charles to Alcuin, and the severity with which those of the monks of St. Martin who had taken part in the broil were treated, proved a cruel blow to the abbat's feelings.[2]

His dispute with Theodulfus.

From this time his health rapidly declined, and repeated attacks of fever warned him of his approaching end. His last acts were marked by the same dignified sense of responsibility and duty that characterised his whole career. The vast revenues of the monastery were accurately ascertained and recorded in a formal register. Fredegis was appointed his successor at Tours; Sigulfus, at Ferrières. Then he wrote his farewell letters—to Charles, soliciting the imperial sanction of his plans relating to the monastic appointments and revenues, thanking him for all the favours that 'had cheered his earthly pilgrimage,' and bidding him a final adieu[3]—to Leo III, beseeching plenary absolution—and to Arno. He would fain have seen his best-loved friend

His last illness and death.

[1] See *Capitula data missis dominicis*, Baluze, i 360.

[2] The story is told at length in Monnier, pp. 343-351.

[3] *Alcuiniana*, pp. 676-7.

CHAP. II.

once more, in order to consult him concerning his regulations for the monasteries and to take a solemn parting.[1] But this was not to be; and, conscious that his work on earth was o'er, Alcuin now sought to concentrate his thoughts and feelings on the contemplation of death. Something of the vague trouble and dread too often discernible in the last hours of the best men of mediaeval times disturbed his feverish close.[2] He was seized by a passionate longing to be conveyed to Fulda, and to die and be laid by the tomb of that great martyr whose memory he so deeply venerated; but it was evident that he would not survive the fatigues of such a journey. In another respect, however, his wishes were singularly fulfilled. He hoped, he said, that he should live to die on the day of Pentecost; and on that day he died, just as the morning broke and the chant had begun in the cathedral of St. Martin.[3]

His character and services estimated.

A sense of the signal service rendered by Alcuin to his age, in days when learning strove but feebly and ineffectually amid the clang of arms and the rude instincts of a semi-barbarous race, must not lead us to exaggerate his merits or his powers. On a dispassionate and candid scrutiny, his views and aims will scarcely appear loftier than his time. By the side of the imperial conceptions—so bold, so original, so comprehensive—his tame adherence to tradition, his timid mistrust of pagan learning, dwarf him almost to littleness. No noble superiority to the superstition of his age stamps him, like Agobard, a master spirit. No heroism of self-devotion, like that of a Columban or a Boniface, bears aloft his memory to a region which detraction cannot reach. He reared no classic monument of historic genius like that of Einhard's.[4]

[1] *Alcuiniana*, pp. 678–9.

[2] 'Hujus vero judicii terrore totus contremesco.' Letter to Arno, Ibid. p. 679. 'O quam timendus est omni homini dies illa.' Letter to Charles, Ibid. p. 677.

[3] 'Pentecostes inlucescente die.' *Annales Petav.*; Pertz, i 18. 'Eadem hora qua ingredi consueverat ad missas, aurora patente.' Migne, c 105.

[4] Compare his very indifferent life of St. Willibrod (on which see a severe criticism by Dümmler in *Alcuiniana*, p. 36) with Einhard's admirable imitation of Suetonius.

He penned no stanzas, like those by Theodulfus, to waft from century to century the burden of the Christian hope until lost in the clamour of the *Marseillaise*.[1] Yet let us not withhold the tribute that is his due. He loved the temple of the Muses, and was at once their high priest and their apostle in days when the worshippers at their shrine were few. He upheld the faith with vigour and ability against its foes; and amid the temptations of a licentious court bore witness to its elevating power, with the eloquent though unuttered testimony of an upright and blameless life. He mediated between the two greatest princes of the West, and the blessing promised to the peacemakers was his. He watched with a father's care over a band of illustrious disciples, who repaid him by a loving obedience while he lived, and by a faithful adherence to his teaching when he was gone. And when on this same morning of Pentecost his spirit passed away, as the monks stood watching round his couch and the voice of the chorister was hushed in weeping, great sorrow fell upon Tours. And wherever throughout Christendom the tidings of the event was told—whether at York, at Aachen, or at Rome—it was felt that a light had been withdrawn from the Church and that a wise teacher of Israel was dead.

[1] The hymn 'Gloria, laus, et honor tibi,' composed by Theodulfus, was sung in France, during the procession on Palm Sunday, until the outbreak of the Revolution.

CHAPTER III.

RABANUS MAURUS: OR, THE SCHOOL AT FULDA.

CHAP. III.

Charles' final labours.

'EUROPE'S lofty beacon' (*Europae celsa pharos*), as Alcuin, on one occasion, styles Charles, continued to shine over Frankland for ten years after Alcuin himself was no more. Neither family bereavement nor the declining fortunes of the empire appear to have diminished the ardour with which the aged emperor still pressed on internal reform, discussed knotty questions in theology, or pursued his literary researches. He gave to the Western Church the grand strains of the *Veni Creator;* his autocratic decision (a trait that reminds us somewhat uncomfortably of the Merovingian Chilperic I) inserted in her *Symbolum*, in defiance of Leo III, the fatal *Filioque;* while, if we may credit Theganus, the last days of his life found him correcting (probably by the aid of Clement of Ireland's superior Greek scholarship) the Vulgate translation of the Gospels.[1]

Lewis the Pious.

The father's love for learning reappeared with undiminished force in his surviving son—the son whom Alcuin, won, as we can well understand, by the young prince's docility and moral virtues, is said to have pronounced the most worthy to wear the imperial crown. The impress of his teaching on Lewis' character is indeed distinctly to be discerned. Lewis was not only an excellent Latin scholar, with some knowledge of Greek; he was also well versed in theology, capable too of discerning not merely the moral and spiritual sense of Scripture, but the anagogical as well. On the lighter literature of paganism, especially its poetry,

[1] 'Et quattuor evangelia Christi . . . in ultimo ante obitus sui diem cum Graecis et Syris optime correxerat.' *Vita Hludowici*, c. 7; Pertz, ii 592.

he looked with an aversion which we can have no difficulty in referring to its true origin.[1] But his chief superiority to his father was in his blameless life. Free from reproach like that which detracted so largely from Charles' moral influence, he could demand, with all the authority derived from a high personal example, that neither in cloister nor canonry should solemn vows and grave responsibilities be permitted to remain a dead letter. He had no sooner ascended the throne than he began to give unmistakeable proof of his determination to enforce and render more stringent both the monastic and the Church discipline. The austere Benedict of Aniane, summoned from his distant cell to take up his abode near Aachen, was appointed chief of the abbats of the empire,[2] and in the capitulary *De vita et conversatione monachorum*, drawn up in the same year at the Council of Aachen, his influence is distinctly to be discerned.

His measures of reform.

Benedict of Aniane.

It is not without reason that the acts of this memorable council have been characterised as 'among the boldest and most comprehensive ever submitted to a great national assembly.'[3] The rule of the canonical life, so far back as the time when Alcuin first visited Frankland, had been rendered far more stringent than that in England by the reforms introduced, in the time of Pepin-le-Bref, by Chrodegang, bishop of Metz. This rule, to quote a high authority, 'differed but little from the rule of St. Benedict, except in the article of poverty.'[4] In the monasteries, again, the Benedictine rule had totally displaced that of Columban; so that towards the close of the eighth century we find Charles instituting enquiry to ascertain whether any monks, other than Benedictines, still existed in his realm.[5] At the Council of Aachen, in 817, the rule of Chrodegang was made the rule of the entire Church; while in the capitulary above

The Council of Aachen, A.D. 817.

The Benedictine rule generally enforced.

[1] 'Poetica carmina gentilia quae in juventute didicerat, respuit, nec legere nec audire nec docere voluit.' *Vita Hludowici*, c. 7; Pertz, ii 954.

[2] 'Propter famam vitae ejus et sanctitatem.' *Chron. Moiss.* Pertz, i 311. *Chron. Farf.* p. 671.

[3] Milman, iii 116.

[4] Stubbs, Pref. to *De Inventione*, p. xi.

[5] Guizot, ii 82.

CHAP. III.

referred to, as reflecting Benedict's influence, the whole discipline of the monastic life was defined with increased stringency. For our special purpose, however, it is most important to note the tendency exhibited to draw a more definite line between the monastic and the lay communities. The progress of the national dialects of Neustria and Austrasia towards distinct languages not improbably furnished an additional incentive to this policy. The discernment of Lewis the Pious, in prescribing the translation of the Scriptures into the *Lingua Teudisca*,[1] had recognised an imperative want—the vulgar and the learned speech could no longer be assumed to be the same. With a somewhat similar scope, Benedict's Capitulary of Aachen required that the school within each monastery should include only those who had actually taken the monastic vows;[2] he even went so far as to prohibit the introduction of the laity into the refectory.

Scholars not designed for the religious life to be separated from the *oblati* in the monastic schools.

From this time, we are accordingly able to distinguish, with somewhat more precision, the different training of the monastic and the episcopal schools. Of the latter, indeed, throughout the ninth century, it is impossible to give much more than a conjectural account, as there existed no systematic organisation. Léon Maitre, in his endeavour to supply the want, presents us with a series of confused gleanings, the greater part of which apply evidently to the schools of the monasteries. Close to the cathedral precincts, and under the immediate supervision of the bishop, a school for boys, all destined to become priests, was confided to the care of one of the canons, known from his office as the *scholasticus*.[3] The institution represented a kind of monopoly of the eccle-

The episcopal schools.

[1] Dom Bouquet, vi 256.

[2] 'Ut schola in monasterio non habeatur nisi eorum qui oblati sunt.' Pertz, *Legg.* i 202. Before this time the bishop of the diocese seems to have possessed the power of sending the sons of the clergy to be educated in the monastic schools. See the Capitulary of Theodulfus of 797, 'si quis ex presbyteris voluerit nepotem suum aut aliquem consanguineum ad scholam mittere in eccl. sanctae Crucis aut in monasterio S. Aniani, aut S. Benedicti, aut S. Lifardi, aut in caeteris de his coenobiis *quae nobis ad regendum concessa sunt*, ei licentiam id faciendi concedimus.' Cossart, xiii 998.

[3] He appears to have been known in the southern provinces under the name of the *capiscolus*. See Léon Maitre, pp. 184–5.

siastical, as opposed to the 'religious,' education of the time, for the chancellor of the cathedral had jurisdiction over the schools for the clergy throughout the diocese. At a later period we find this latter functionary asserting claims over abbey lands, claims not unchallenged by the abbat, and endeavouring to levy a tax on all who assumed the office of teacher—but these encroachments belong to the tenth and eleventh centuries. CHAP. III.

Character of the education there given.

The education provided in these schools may be described as a kind of minor to the Benedictine major. In the range of subjects it probably went little beyond the teaching of the schools of Cassian, but its method was more careful and efficient. We may picture to ourselves a group of lads seated on the floor, which was strewn with clean straw, their waxen tablets in their hands, and busily engaged in noting down the words read by the *scholasticus* from his manuscript volume. So rarely did the pupil, in those days, gain access to a book, that to *read* (*legere*) became synonymous with to *teach*. The scholars traced the words on their tablets, and afterwards, when their notes had been corrected by the master, transferred them to a little parchment volume, the treasured depository, with many, of nearly all the learning they managed to acquire in life.[1] We have already investigated the probable extent and character of that learning, and it may safely be assumed that in the cathedral school the customary limits were seldom passed. In the ninth century, at least, only two centres of Church education in Frankland stand forth as examples of a higher culture—the one, that at Orleans, under Theodulfus; the other, that at Rheims.

The schools at Orleans and Rheims.

The lively interest taken by Theodulfus in everything that related to the education of his day is attested by numerous facts, though in his leaning to a policy of conservatism he strongly resembled Alcuin. He mistrusted the

[1] So Rabanus Maurus, when petitioning the abbat of Fulda for the return of his books, says,—

'Me quia quaecumque docuerunt ore magistri,
Ne vaga mens perdat, cuncta dedi foliis.' Migne, cxii 1600-1.

CHAP. III.

tendencies exhibited in Martianus Capella, but he could not fail to be aware how great an attraction that writer's allegorical method of treatment possessed for the ordinary learner. He accordingly himself composed a poem of about a hundred lines containing a fanciful description of the subjects of the *trivium* and *quadrivium*, wherein, however, all sceptical or speculative discourse was carefully eschewed.[1] We can hardly suppose, from the character of the composition, that it enjoyed much popularity beyond the range of the bishop's own diocese. Ably seconded by the poet Wulfin, Theodulfus raised the school at Orleans to considerable eminence. It became especially famous for the number, beauty, and accuracy of its manuscripts. Léon Maitre, on somewhat doubtful evidence, inclines to the belief that it was also distinguished as a school of civil law.

Yet more renowned was the episcopal school at Rheims, which, under the protection of Hincmar, the oracle and arbiter of the state in the days of Charles the Bald, and under the teaching of archbishop Fulk, of Remy of Auxerre, and of Hucbald, claims the proud distinction of having preserved, in this century, that tradition of learning which links the episcopal schools with the University of Paris.

But throughout the ninth century, and indeed for the greater part of the period known as 'the Benedictine era,'—the four centuries preceding the reign of Philip Augustus,—the work of the episcopal schools was completely eclipsed by that of the monasteries. At Corbey, near Amiens, under Adelhard and Wala, who both retired thither, and under Paschasius Radbertus, was gathered a society eminent for its learning and illustrious as a parent foundation. It disappears beneath the waves of the Norman invasion; but its namesake, New Corbey, in Saxony, sustained with equal reputation, and more auspicious fortunes, the scholarly traditions of the age.[2] The great abbey of St. Riquier, under the rule of Angilbert, rivalled the school at Rheims in lit-

The monastic schools at Corbey, St. Riquier, St. Martin of Metz, St. Bertin, &c.

[1] See *De Septem Liberalibus in quadam pictura depictis.* Migne, cv 333–5.

[2] *Walae Vita.* Mabillon, vol. v; Pertz, ii 578–81.

erary activity; and an inventory of its possessions, made in the year 831 by the direction of Lewis the Pious, included a library of no less than 231 volumes.[1] The abbey of St. Martin at Metz, under the rule of Aldricus, was scarcely less celebrated;[2] a Bible presented by its monks to Charles the Bald and the missal of bishop Drogo are still preserved, and rank among the most valued specimens of ninth-century art. The society of St. Mihiel-sur-Meuse enjoyed the instruction of Smaragdus, whose compend from Donatus frequently appears in the catalogues of the libraries of the period. St. Bertin, in the diocese of Cambrai, laid claim to the distinguished honour of having educated Grimbald, king Alfred's able seconder in his efforts towards a restoration of learning in England.[3] At Ferrières, in the Gâtinais, the genius of Lupus Servatus shone forth in the troublous and disheartening period which immediately preceded and followed upon the division of the empire.

The South and the South-West present fewer evidences of culture; and in the ninth century no foundation, either in Normandy or Brittany, can be said to have reached celebrity; while in Aquitaine, if we except the labours of Benedict of Aniane in the diocese of Montpellier, the efforts of Lewis the Pious on behalf of his patrimonial kingdom seem to have been baffled by the frequent recurrence of war.

Decline of the school at Tours.

Amid the evidence of these widespread results from the movement with which Alcuin's name is identified, it is melancholy to note how completely his own monastery failed to maintain the reputation acquired under his sway. Learning has rarely prospered in conjunction with inordinate wealth, and Tours proved no exception to the rule. Fredegis, the new abbat, with his worldly tastes and fantastic notions in philosophy, was not the man to enforce discipline or give example to a learned community. He was, however, from his influence at court, where he was in frequent attendance on the emperor, and often employed on diplomatic missions, well able to watch over the material interests of the abbey,

Fredegis.

[1] Léon Maitre, p. 66.

[2] Baluze, *Miscell.* i 19.

[3] Bollandus, *Juillet*, ii 651.

CHAP. III.

and his appointment was consequently popular with the monks. As for the monastery itself, Alcuin, long before his death, seems to have clearly foreseen that its enormous revenues, the frequent visits of aristocratic guests with their retinues, and almost incessant commerce with the world without, rendered it in the highest degree improbable that the Benedictine rule would long continue to be faithfully observed. He had done what lay in his power to found a house of stricter discipline, by sending twenty monks from his own cell of St. Judoc[1] to form the nucleus of a new society at Cormery. In relation to Tours, his forebodings proved only too just; within a few years, this richly-endowed foundation acquired an unenviable notoriety from the fact that it demanded the payment of fees from its scholars. The school for the *externi*, by a kind of tacit agreement, seems to have been converted into an exclusive and aristocratic centre of education for the sons of the wealthier laity. Amalaric, the archbishop of the diocese—who claimed jurisdiction over the school, as one partly designed for the education of his own clergy—energetically denounced what he stigmatised as an abominable practice, and ordered that no fees should be taken except those that were spontaneously offered.[2] We may willingly conclude, indeed, that Tours was an exception to the rule; it must certainly have appeared a singular contrast when the traveller saw inscribed over the portals of the far less wealthy foundation of St. Peter at Salzburg, the encouraging words,

Alcuin's forebodings verified.

Fees exacted from the scholars.

Discere si cupias, gratis, quod quaeris, habebis.[3]

Towards the middle of the century, the position of the monastery of Tours on the banks of the Loire exposed it to the full brunt of the Norman invasion. It was mercilessly plundered; and when, two centuries later, it again became famous, it was in connexion with the brilliant heterodoxy of Berengar.

[1] 'Cellam sancti Judoci, quam magnus Carolus quondam Alcuino ad eleemosynam exhibendam peregrinis commiserat.' Lupus Serv. *Epist.* 11. It was given to Alcuin in 792. *Gallia Christiana*, x 1289.

[2] Léon Maitre, pp. 49, 203.

[3] The concluding line of some verses attributed to Alcuin. Migne, ci 757.

It is not, however, only in separate dioceses and isolated monasteries that we have evidence of well-sustained efforts towards bringing about a more general diffusion of education. To Lewis the Pious the Church and the culture of her ministers were objects of increasing care. 'The state's advancement in holy learning and holy life,' one admiring biographer assures us, absorbed alike his hours of business and of recreation.[1] And while his incapacity for military and political affairs excited the contempt of count Wala and the nobility, he had, in Benedict of Aniane, a friend ever ready to advise and to strengthen his natural feebleness of purpose. It is possible that Benedict's death, in 821, caused a temporary suspension of the emperor's efforts, for in the following year, at the Council of Attigny,—on the same occasion as that on which he did public penance for his cruelty towards his nephew Bernard and his severity towards Adelhard and Wala,—the language of a new decree concerning the schools for the clergy implies a consciousness of undue remissness in this respect. Learning and preaching, says this capitulary, are essential to the welfare of the state; but the preacher's office can be rightly discharged only by learned men; hence it is of primary importance that such men should be found in every locality. It is accordingly decreed that every individual, whether a youth or an adult, in course of training with the view of occupying any position in the Church, shall have a fixed place of resort and a suitable master. If the extent of a parish should render it impracticable to assemble the scholars at any one centre, other schools are to be opened, to meet the difficulty. Parents and lords are required to provide for the maintenance of each scholar 'in order that indigence may not debar him from a course of study.'[2] In the following year,

Lewis' reforms.

[1] 'Haec erat sancti Imperatoris exercitatio, hic cotidianus ludus, haec palaestrica agonia, spectante eo quo civitas in sancta doctrina et operatione clarius eniteret.' *Vit. Ludov.* c. 28; Pertz, ii 622.

[2] 'Quia vero liquido constat, quod salus populi maxime in doctrina et praedicatione consistat, et praedicatio eadem impleri ita ut oportet non potest, nisi a doctis, necesse est, ut ordo talis in singulis sedibus inveniatur, per quam et praesens emendatio et futura utilitas sanctae ecclesiae preparetur;

CHAP. III.

we find the austere monarch recalling to the recollection of the episcopal order their promises, already given, to found schools wherever necessity demanded, 'for the benefit of the faithful and the ministers of the Church.'[1] This reminder was met in the ensuing year, by a decree of the episcopal council convened at Paris, when it was resolved that it was desirable that each bishop 'should henceforth exercise greater diligence in instituting schools and in training and educating soldiers for the service of Christ's Church;' 'whenever,' it was added, 'a provincial council of the order is convened, let each bishop cause his *scholastici* to attend the same, in order that their efforts may be under due control.'[2]

Petition of the bishops for the founding of three public schools, A.D. 829.

That these endeavours to bring about a great and general reform were on the point of being crowned with considerable success may be inferred from the fact that in the year 829, on the eve of the rebellion of Lewis' sons, the bishops again assembled at Paris and drew up a petition to the emperor, in which they besought him to provide for the establishment of *three large public schools*, in the three most suitable places in the empire, 'in order that his father's efforts and his own might not fall into decay.'[3] These schools were to be open to the clergy and the monasteries alike; and had the scheme been carried into effect, it is not improbable that the historian, in exploring the *origines* of our European universities, might have found it necessary to revert three centuries further back for the purpose of tracing out their first commencement. But in the following year the war broke out, and from that time up to the death of Lewis the Pious and

Outbreak of civil war.

. . . scholas autem, de quibus hactenus minus studiosi fuimus quam debueramus, omnino studiosissime emendare cupimus, qualiter omnis homo sive majoris sive minoris aetatis, qui ad hoc nutritur ut in aliquo gradu in ecclesia promoveatur, locum denominatum et magistrum congruum habeat. Parentes tamen vel domini singulorum de victu vel substantia corporali unde subsistant providere studeant, qualiter solacium habeant, ut propter rerum inopiam doctrinae studio non recedant. Si vero necessitas fuerit propter amplitudinem parroechiae, eo quod in uno loco colligi non possunt propter administrationem quam eis procuratores eorum providere debent, fiat locis duobus aut tribus, vel etiam ut necessitas et ratio dictaverit.' Pertz, *Legg.* i 231.

[1] Baluze, i 634.

[2] Ibid. i 1137.

[3] Quoted in Léon Maitre, p. 25.

the division of the empire in 841, the arts of peace had small scope for developement. The deacon Florus, in that lugubrious chant wherein he compares the past and present condition of the disunited and desolated realm, draws the contrast in colours which seem respectively to belong to eras separated by centuries: CHAP. III.

Lament of Florus.

'Omne bonum pacis odiis laniatur acerbis,
Omne decus regni furiis fuscatur iniquis:
Ecclesiae dejectus honos jacet ecce sepultus;
Jura sacerdotum penitus eversa ruerunt;
Divinae jam legis amor terrorque recessit;
Et scita jam canonum cunctorum calce teruntur.'

. . . . . .

Quis digne expediat monachorum saepta revulsa
Sacratas Domini famulas laicale subisse
Infami ditione jugum, rectoribus ipsis
Ecclesiae armorum impositum caedisque periclum?'

Such is the picture he exhibits side by side with that when,

'Princeps unus erat, populus quoque subditus unus:
Lex simul et judex totas ornaverat urbes:
Pax cives tenuit, virtus exterruit hostes:
Alma sacerdotum certatim cura vigebat
Conciliis crebris, populus pia jura ministrans.
Hinc sacris cleris, hinc plebibus eximiisque
Principibus late resonabat sermo salutis.
Discebant juvenes divina volumina passim:
Litterea artes puerorum corda bibebant.'[1]

We have already adverted to the somewhat ascetic tendencies of Lewis' character and his dislike, inherited from Alcuin, of pagan literature; some writers, indeed, while admitting that education became more widely diffused under his rule, have been disposed to look upon the period as one of retrogression as regards the higher culture. It is certain that during the last twelve years of his reign, the most conspicuous efforts of learning and philosophy are to be looked for in regions comparatively remote from his influence and far beyond the limits of modern France.

[1] Flori Diaconi Lugdunensis *Querela de Divisione Imperii post Mortem Ludovici Pii*, Dom Bouquet, vii 301–2.

CHAP. III.

Rabanus Maurus, *b.* 776; *d.* 856.

Before Alcuin died, there had come to Tours a young monk, a native of Mayence, attracted by the great teacher's fame and burning with the desire for knowledge. He came from Fulda, where ever since the time of Sturm, its first abbat and the disciple of St. Boniface, down to that of Baugulfus, the Benedictine rule had been maintained with a fidelity which earned for the monastery the reverence of all Frankland. Rabanus—for it is of him we speak—at the time that he entered the walls of St. Martin, in the year 802, was probably about twenty-six years of age;[1] the names of some of his fellow-students at Fulda shew that the school was already in repute as a centre of learning. Among the number, about this time, was Bernard, the grandson of Charles the Great, afterwards king of Italy, whose tragical end leaves so dark a stain on the memory of Lewis the Pious. There were also Baturicus, Treculfus, and Haymo, afterwards respectively raised to the sees of Regensburg, Lisieux, and Halberstadt; and Samuel, afterwards bishop of Worms, who preceded Rabanus to Tours and returned with him from thence to Fulda. Baugulfus, in the year 802, laid down his office as abbat, and was succeeded by Ratgar, an energetic, though, as we shall shortly see, a far from desirable head. Ratgar seems to have been really desirous, at this time, of maintaining the reputation of Fulda, and with this view he placed the most promising of the younger monks under the instruction of the ablest scholars of the day. Candidus was sent to receive instruction from Einhard; Modestus, from Clement of Ireland; Rabanus, at his own urgent request, to Tours, to sit at the feet of Alcuin. About the third year of the ninth century we accordingly find these two meeting for the first time, their sentiments and aims in singular contrast—the young monk, with desires that stretched from Fulda to Tours in the quest of learning—the aged abbat, with his thoughts turning from Tours to Fulda in the expectation of death.

Fulda as a centre of education.

Rabanus is sent from Fulda to Alcuin at Tours.

Rabanus remained at Tours for only one year, but the

[1] See *Leben des heiligen Rhabanus Maurus*, by Spengler: Regensburg, 1856; a more critical production than the better known Life by Kunstmann.

time amply sufficed for him to win the abbat's marked favour. His devotion and filial affection induced Alcuin to bestow upon him the name of Maurus. St. Maur was the favourite disciple of St. Benedict, and in giving Rabanus this name, Alcuin intended to imply that the obedience and piety of the young monk of Monte Cassino had found their counterpart at Tours.[1] Rabanus returned to Fulda, having conceived a deep, perhaps an exaggerated, admiration for his preceptor, and bent upon an exact reproduction of his teaching. He was accompanied by Samuel, in whom he afterwards found a sympathising and able co-operator in his plans. A letter from Alcuin, written in the same year, shews that the kindly thought of the infirm old man followed his disciple across the Rhine, and conveys his greetings to the whole community at Fulda. Rabanus, it would seem, had written to beg that Alcuin would favour him with a narrative of his own life; emulous of his revered teacher's fame and virtues, he would fain take example thereby. Alcuin, however, modestly expresses his surprise at the request, and intimates that a far better pattern of life is to be found in the careers of the holy men of Scripture.

His return to Fulda.

Soon after his return to Fulda, Rabanus was appointed teacher of the monastery school. He was now in his twenty-seventh or twenty-eighth year, and we may well believe that no better selection could possibly have been made. It was not his good fortune to find, in the earlier part of his experience, a sphere of labour as tranquil and dignified as that which Alcuin enjoyed at Tours. With the commencement of the century, the Saxons again rose in insurrection, and Fulda was in the centre of the war. The surrounding districts were visited by famine, and in the year 807 a malignant fever carried off the majority of the monks. The numbers fell from 400 to 150; and among those who died were many of the younger and most promising members. The scholars rebelled and fled. The incidents of a subse-

Is appointed teacher of the monastery school.

Calamitous experiences of the community.

[1] In one of his poems (Migne, ci 794) Alcuin addresses Rabanus as 'sancti puer Benedicti;' see also the letter addressed 'Benedicto sancti Benedicti puero.' Ibid. c 398.

CHAP. III.

Misrule of Ratgar.

quent episode in the history of the society afford a curious illustration of the conditions under which the monastic life was pursued in these times. The abbat, Ratgar, had a passion for building, which seems to have amounted almost to a monomania, and his sole idea was the completion and adornment of a new church and other erections in connexion with the monastery. The recent loss in numbers only suggested to him the necessity of demanding more strenuous exertion from the remaining hands; and the severity with which his exactions were now enforced almost served to recall the condition of the Israelites under Pharaoh. All study was at an end, the most promising students being deprived of their books. The masses were reduced in number. Many of the monks died, worn out by toil, and often, to the universal scandal, without having received the last sacraments. In the *libellus supplex*, which they eventually presented to the emperor, they describe the culpable neglect of the sick, the cruelty with which the infirm were refused even a staff to support them in walking; while at the same time lures were held out to induce strangers to join the community, with the sole view of gaining possession of their property. Of these many were utterly unqualified for the monastic life, and their conduct brought the discipline of the house to a state of utter demoralisation. Rabanus was among those who were compelled to surrender their books, and the verses are still extant in which he pleads pathetically for their return. He implores Ratgar, whom he styles (we must suppose by poetic licence) *monachorum optime pastor*, to restore the cherished volumes, in order that the instruction he has himself received from the abbat and noted down may not fade from his memory. He begs for them not as his own property, for he, a monk, has nothing he can rightfully call his own, but as a gracious favour, which, once conceded, he will never fail to offer up prayers on his superior's behalf.[1]

Sufferings and discontent of the monks.

Ratgar, however, remained totally unmoved by these and similar entreaties; but at last some report of the state of affairs reached the imperial ears, and Riculfus, archbishop

[1] Migne, cxii 1600-1; see also *supra*, p. 131, n. 1.

CHAP. III.

of Mayence (Alcuin's 'Damoetas'), was sent to institute an enquiry. The archbishop, himself an energetic builder,[1] seems to have been more pleased by Ratgar's architectural designs than concerned at the suspension of the work of education; he not merely uttered no protest, but even consented to consecrate the new church, then just completed and dedicated to the Virgin. On his departure, Ratgar accordingly pushed on the works with fresh vigour. He appropriated a tenth of the monastic property to replenish the building fund, and forthwith began to erect another church at Johannisberg, ten stades distant. The toil of the monks became yet more painful, and they now resolved on sending a deputation to the emperor. Ratgar, when he heard of this proceeding, started himself for court, and arrived before the deputation, who found themselves completely forestalled. At length the state of the monastic discipline became too notorious to be any longer disregarded, and the emperor vouchsafed to appoint a commission of enquiry. It consisted of four bishops, who after hearing the complaints of the monks, drew up a formal agreement, to be binding on both sides. They then presided at the consecration of the church at Johannisberg, and having thus given an indirect sanction to the abbat's policy, departed. The warning appears to have been altogether lost on Ratgar, who shortly after attempted to erect at Tullifield a 'cell' in connexion with the monastery at Fulda. This time, however, the evidence arising from the violated agreement was too indisputable to be gainsaid, and in the year 817 he was deposed from his office. He was succeeded, after a long interval, by a man of very different character, the gentle Eigil, the builder of the 'Michaelskapelle,' which, as recently restored, still attracts the curiosity of the traveller journeying from Frankfort to Gotha. Eigil had been expelled from the monastery by the unfeeling Ratgar on account of his feeble health and inability to work; he lived to take a noble

Their efforts to obtain redress.

Ratgar is deposed and Eigil appointed in his place.

[1] Riculfus, who held the archbishopric twenty-six years, rebuilt the church and built the monastery ('percelebre monasterium,' says Einhard) at Mayence. See *Gallia Christiana*, v 444; Einhard, *De Translatione*, Opera (ed. Teulet), ii 372; *Monumenta Moguntina* (ed. Jaffé), p. 3.

CHAP. III.

revenge. Within a few months after his election to the abbatship, Ratgar appeared as a suppliant for re-admission. It was not in Eigil's power to grant this request, but his influence was used to gain for it a favourable response at court, and Ratgar, for thirteen years longer, lived a submissive and penitent member of the community which had suffered so much at his hands.

The monastery school re-opened.

Between Eigil and Rabanus there appears to have existed the most complete sympathy; the latter was reinstated in his post as teacher of the monastery school, and his reputation soon drew around him a body of scholars far exceeding the former in number. To such a degree was this the case, that the decree of the Council of Aachen, promulgated in the preceding year, for separating the *oblati* from the *externes*, was felt as a sensible relief, and a second school was erected outside the monastery walls. Eigil's tenure of his office lasted only three years and a half, after which the vacancy occasioned by his death was forthwith filled by the unanimous election of Rabanus. From this time we may look upon the influence of the new abbat not merely as supreme at Fulda, but also as sensibly felt throughout the empire. It becomes accordingly an enquiry of no little interest and importance to endeavour to ascertain, with some precision and certainty, the extent and nature of those services which have won for him the title of *primus Germaniae praeceptor*.

His *De Institutione Clericorum.*

It was in the year that he was again installed as instructor at Fulda, the year 819, that Rabanus composed the treatise by which he is probably best known,—the *De Institutione Clericorum*. He had already, through the influence of Baugulfus, been admitted a deacon of the Church,—a step probably designed to pave the way for that promotion to ecclesiastical dignities for which his talents marked him out; and his efforts from this time seem to have been directed rather to clerical than monastic education. If we imagine a tutor at Cambridge, one like Whichcote of Emmanuel in the seventeenth century, or like Laughton of Clare Hall in the eighteenth, actually engaged in the work of instruction,

compiling a Student's Guide for the use of his pupils, the scope and character of such a work, making due allowance for widely different conditions, would fairly represent the aim of Rabanus in the ninth century. On November 1, 819, Haistulfus, the archbishop of Maintz, came to consecrate the new monastery church at Fulda, and was formally presented by Rabanus with a copy of his new treatise.

The *De Institutione Clericorum* has more than once been justly appealed to, as evidence that strongly contravenes the exaggerated representations of certain writers with respect to the ignorance of the clergy in these times. The mere fact that it was compiled to meet a recognised want, and at the request of many of the community at Fulda, is alone sufficient proof that the prevailing tone was far from being one of vulgar and illiterate contempt for learning. The precepts enjoined are founded upon acknowledged and well-ascertained authority—on Cyprian, Hilary, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Cassiodorus, Gregory, and John of Damascus; but it is worthy of note that while, in laying down the canon of Scripture, Rabanus adverts to the doubt recorded by Isidorus with respect to the authenticity of the Epistle to the Hebrews,[1] he gives no sanction to the spurious letter to the Laodiceans, which Alcuin had transcribed in the famous 'Charlemagne's Bible.'[2]

The rules therein laid down derived mainly from the Fathers.

With respect to pagan literature and secular learning, the tone of Rabanus resembles that of Alcuin, but he exhibits far more liberality of sentiment.[3] He deems it necessary, it is true, to vindicate the study of the laws of metre, on the ground that they are applicable to the Hebrew psalter, and that the metrical art has been cultivated by many Christian poets; but, so far from condemning the perusal of pagan

Greater liberality of sentiment than in Alcuin's writings.

[1] '. . . eandemque alii Barnabam conscripsisse, alii a Clemente scriptam fuisse suspicantur.' *Opera*, vi 30.

[2] Still preserved in the British Museum.

[3] His definition of grammar—'Grammatica est scientia interpretandi poetas atque historicos et recte scribendi loquendique ratio. Haec et origo et fundamentum est artium liberalium' (vi 41)—would appear to imply that he was endeavouring to revert to that more liberal conception of the study which Gregory and Alcuin had sought to set aside: see supra, p. 77.

CHAP. III.

His estimate of pagan literature, rhetoric, and dialectic.

poetry, he implicitly recommends it, simply advising the rejection of the dross and the appropriation of the gold. As for rhetoric, he urges that though its especial province is the arena of civil disputes, it has also its uses in the Church. It renders the preacher better able to expound the word of God. Who, he asks, will seriously maintain that truth, in opposing error, is bound to enter upon the conflict unarmed, so that while those who seek to persuade others to believe what is false shall understand how to bespeak the attention and goodwill of their audience, and to express their ideas concisely, plainly, and plausibly, their opponents shall be wholly destitute of such capacity?[1] With respect to dialectic (which, following Alcuin, he includes with rhetoric under the head of logic)[2] his divergence from his master's views is still more discernible. In fact, it would seem that the decline of the orthodox mistrust of the art may be held to date from his teaching.[3] He assigns to dialectic a real and special value. 'Dialectica,' says Alcuin, 'est disciplina rationalis quaerendi, diffiniendi, et disserendi, etiam et vera a falsis discernendi potens.' His disciple repeats this definition, but adds, 'haec *ergo disciplina disciplinarum est, haec docet docere, scit scire sola et scientes facere non solum vult sed etiam potest.*' 'Wherefore,' he goes on to say, 'it behoves the clergy to become acquainted with this *most noble art*, that they may thereby be able accurately to discern the craftiness of unbelievers, and to confute their assertions by the magical conclusions of syllogisms.'[4]

[1] 'Nam cum per artem rhetoricam et vera suadeantur et falsa, quis audeat dicere adversus mendacium in defensoribus suis inermem debere consistere veritatem, ut videlicet illi qui res falsas suadere conantur, noverint auditorem vel benivolem, vel intentum, vel facere docilem procœmio, isti autem non noverint? Ille falsa breviter, aperte, verisimiliter, et isti vera sic narrent ut audire taedeat, intelligere non pateat, credere postremo non libeat? illi fallacibus argumentis veritatem oppugnent, asserant falsitatem, isti nec vera defendere nec falsa valeant refutare?' vi 41.

[2] 'Logica autem dividitur in duas species, hoc est dialecticam et rhetoricam.' *De Universo* xv i; Migne, cxi 444.

[3] Prantl readily admits, while denying Rabanus' authorship of the gloss on Boethius, that his teaching had 'auf den Betrieb der Logik einen höchst günstigen Einfluss.' *Gesch. d. Logik*, ii 40.

[4] '*Quapropter oportet clericos hanc artem nobilissimam scire* . . . ut

CHAP. III.

Philosophy.

A similar breadth of judgement characterises his treatment of philosophy. He holds that if any of the schools, and especially the Platonists, are to be found maintaining doctrine that harmonises with the Christian faith, instead of regarding their teaching with mistrust, we shall do well to convert it to our own use. Just as the Israelites, when they went forth from Egypt, while they looked with abhorrence on the idols of their masters, bore off their gold and silver vessels. With how much silver and raiment, he exclaims, did Cyprian, that most delightful teacher and blessed martyr, Lactantius, Victorinus, Optatus, and St. Hilary, and 'innumerabiles grammatici,' go forth from the Egyptian land! We can hardly doubt that Julian's decree must have been present to his mind, when he observes that paganism would never have permitted such men as these to share in its culture, could it have foreseen how that culture would be converted into a weapon for its own overthrow.[1] The words with which, when discussing the preacher's art, he enforces the necessity of reaching the comprehension of one's audience, and of aiming accordingly at the many rather than the few, might well have been inscribed in letters of gold on every pulpit from his own to the present day.[2]

Trite and commonplace as these sentiments now appear, they were no less novel and forcible at the time when they were put forth; and the modern reader, who contrasts them with the vague generalities that make up so large a portion of Alcuin's writings, can hardly fail to be struck with their comparatively vigorous and practical character.

His commentary on St. Matthew.

In the same year that he was elected abbat, Rabanus completed his commentary on St. Matthew—the first of his voluminous labours in the field of Scriptural exposition. It

subtiliter haereticorum versutiam hac possint dignoscere eorumque dicta veneficatis syllogismorum conclusionibus confutare.' *De Inst. Clericorum, Opera*, vi 42.

[1] 'Quibus omnibus viris superstitiosa gentium consuetudo, et maximo illis temporibus cum, Christi recutiens jugum, Christianos persequebatur, disciplinas quas utiles habebat nunquam commodaret si eas in usum colendi unius Dei, quo vanus idolorum cultus exscinderetur, conversas suspicaretur.' vi 44.

[2] Ibid. p. 46.

CHAP. III.

is no slight evidence, in contravention of the theory that the Bible was a rare and neglected book in these times, to find that the treatise had been prepared at the earnest request of the brethren, who complained that they had not so full and complete a commentary on this as on the other Evangelists.[1] It probably indicates the bias of his theological training, and possibly the feeling evoked by Charles' imperious adoption of the *Filioque*, that while referring to the commentaries by Origen and other Greek Fathers, he explains that the expositions which he has actually used are those of Cyprian, Eusebius, Hilary, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Fulgentius, Victorinus, Fortunianus, Orosius, Leo, Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory the Great, and John Chrysostom. On the traditional theory of interpretation he insists with special emphasis. The 'four senses,' he says, are the four daughters of wisdom. Of these, the first, or historical sense, is compared to 'milk for babes;' while, for those advancing in knowledge, there is the allegorical; those of approved piety and abounding in good works are to be satisfied with the strong meat of the tropological; while for those whose contempt of earthly pleasures is complete, and whose affections are fixed solely on heavenly joys, there is reserved the wine of anagoge.[2]

Extravagancies of his anagogical interpretation.

It must be confessed that the fantastic interpretation of the simple narrative of Scripture which we find under the head of *Anagogiae* is such as no sober criticism can commend. When we are told that, in the passage 'as many as touched the fringe of His garment were made whole,' the fringe denotes the incarnation of our Lord,—that the basket of rushes in which Moses was placed symbolised the Virgin Mary,—that the hook spoken of in Job xli 1 is the type of Christ's humanity,—that the 'sea of glass' described in the Apocalypse is the ordinance of baptism,—while the frogs mentioned

[1] Yet, notwithstanding, Rabanus was compelled to undergo the envy and depreciation of that numerous class to be found in centres of learning in all ages, 'quorum nemo potest calumniam et invidos morsus devitare, nisi qui omnino nihil scribit.' *Opera*, v 1.

[2] See 'Anagogiae,' *Opera*, v 749–823.

CHAP. III.

by the Psalmist are heretics ('quod conventicula caecorum et ignorantium loquaces proferunt haereticos et immundos'), we feel that the most capricious exposition of the 'conventicles' of the seventeenth century was hardly surpassed by that of the venerated abbat of Fulda in the ninth. The triumph of a critic of the school of D'Aubigné would perhaps be complete when he found that Rabanus shared with Tertullian a belief in the efficacy of prayers for the dead.[1]

But while not disguising the errors which Rabanus held in common with his age, it will be more material to our purpose to note those points wherein he appears superior not only to his master, but to most of his contemporaries. Perhaps there is no respect in which he contrasts more favourably with Alcuin than when he has occasion to deal with natural phenomena. The tendency of Alcuin's mind seems to have been to assign to every occult cause a supernatural origin; Rabanus, on the contrary, sought to resolve each phenomenon into facts in harmony with the ordinary course of nature. Of this his treatise *De Magicis Artibus*, written in the year 842, affords remarkable evidence. He seems to have clearly comprehended the theory represented by what in modern philosophy is known as a 'subjective illusion,' whereby the appearance of ghosts, evil spirits, and similar manifestations, are referred to a deception of the senses under the influence of overwrought mental faculties. To this class of experiences he maintains, for instance, that we must refer the appearance of Samuel to Saul, when the latter had recourse to the witch of Endor; looking upon it 'as true not in fact, but with respect to the perception and mind of Saul.'[2]

His superiority to Alcuin in his interpretation of natural phenomena.

Theory of subjective illusions.

If we remember how often the narrative in question has been cited as incontestable proof of the reality of the powers

[1] 'Orationibus vero sanctae ecclesiae et sacrificio salutari et eleemosynis quae pro illorum spiritibus erogantur, non est dubitandum mortuos adjuvari, &c.' *Homilia de vigiliis defunctorum*, v 624.

[2] 'Sed si quis propter historiam ut ea quae verbis expressa sunt putet non praetermittenda, ne ratio historiae inanis sit, recte faciet quidem si tamen minime istud *ad veri rapiat rationem sed ad visum et intellectum Saul.*' *Opera*, vi 170.

CHAP. III.

assumed under the term witchcraft, and also recall to what an extent that belief, together with trial by ordeal, prevailed in Rabanus' time, sanctioned as it was, moreover, by the opinions of Fathers and the decrees of Councils, we shall readily admit that the maintenance of a theory like the foregoing attests a remarkable, though not a unique instance of individual superiority to the popular delusions of the ninth century.[1]

He rebukes the superstition of the natives.

It was in much the same light that Rabanus appears to have regarded the science of astrology. Whilst Alcuin taught that comets were the souls of recently departed saints, his disciple endeavoured as much as possible to discourage a superstitious interpretation of celestial phenomena. In one of his homilies we have an interesting illustration of the manner in which he sought to deal with this class of delusions. The inhabitants of the district round Fulda were, in many respects, scarcely less superstitious than in the days of St. Boniface; and one of Rabanus' homilies is a remonstrance with those 'who would fain render help to the waning moon.' 'Some days ago,' he says, 'when I was thinking over in the evening, within my house, something that should be to your spiritual good, I heard outside an outcry that seemed as though it would reach the sky. On enquiring into the cause of this alarm, I was told that it was intended to aid the moon, then on the wane. The following morning, some who came to see me told me that they had observed the same thing in their district; and that horns had been blown as though to rouse the neighbourhood to battle. Some imitated the grunting of swine; others flung darts or fire in the direction of the moon, for they said a monster was tearing it in pieces, and would certainly devour it did they not come to the rescue. With the same view some even cut down the hedges of their gardens, and smashed all the crockery in their houses, in order, forsooth, to scare away the monster. My brethren, this story is all a fable. God's hand is over all His works to protect them,

[1] Agobard's noble protest against duelling, in his *Liber contra judicium Dei*, is another eminent exception.

and man is far too feeble to render Him aid. This appearance of the moon has a simply natural cause. For it is evident to reason that when the moon, whose orbit is the less, comes between, the sun cannot pour its light upon our eyes, and this happens during the time of his rising; and in like manner, the moon, which is lightened by the sun, becomes obscured by the shadow of the earth at full moon —that is, in the fifteenth day of its age, when the sun shines in one quarter of the heavens, the moon in another.[1] No need is there, then, to seek to give her help. God has thus ordered it, and He knows, right well, how to manage all that He has created.'

It is in like manner that we find his voice uplifted, in the succeeding homily, against the practice, far from uncommon in his time, of consulting astrologers and fortune-tellers; though here he can be regarded simply as echoing the utterance of the Church, and his discourse is evidence rather of the survival of pagan customs in the district than of any special enlightenment on the part of the preacher. In some respects, indeed, Rabanus fully shared the superstition of his age. Holding, probably, that the end justified the means, and that the religious feelings of the laity were largely stimulated by such objects of veneration, he was indefatigable in his endeavours to obtain the relics of saints. Those of St. Alexander, St. Quirinus, St. Caecilia, and many others, were, with the imperial sanction, collected and de-deposited in costly shrines at Fulda or some neighbouring locality. The enthusiasm they excited was productive of no

His own superstitious veneration of relics.

[1] 'Nam manifesta ratio probat, solem interventu lunae, quae inferior cursu, lumen ad nostros oculos non posse perfundere, quod sit in tempore ascensionis ejus; lunam vero similiter, quae a sole illustratur, per umbram terrae obscurari in pleni lunio, hoc est in quintadecima die aetatis ejus, quando sol in alia parte coeli ex alia luna relucet.' *Opera*, v 606. It is evident, from this passage, that Rabanus supposed the moon's changes to be attributable to conditions identical with those of an eclipse! There are two homilies (100 and 101) delivered by Maximus, bishop of Turin in the fifth century, *De Defectione Lunae* (Migne, lvii 384), to which Rabanus' discourse has a suspicious resemblance. The editors have there supposed that Maximus is referring to an eclipse; but the context shews that he uses *defectio* in the same sense as *defectus* is used by Cicero and by Vergil, i.e. as equivalent to *decrescentia*.

CHAP. III.

small increase in the ecclesiastical revenues, though the wealth thus obtained appears to have been conscientiously devoted to building new churches, or adorning and improving those already existing.

Points of contrast with Alcuin.

Enough has, however, been adduced to suggest that Rabanus, though firmly holding by the theological traditions which he inherited from Alcuin, did so in a spirit and a manner which were at once conservative and progressive. Possessing a robuster intellect, and less trammelled by servile habits of thought, he not only enlarged the whole conception of monastic and ecclesiastical culture, but also brought to bear upon each subject of instruction something of novelty of treatment and independence of judgement. In one respect —one in which Alcuin was certainly deficient—in the art, namely, of exposition, he appears to have signally excelled. His teaching was characterised by a quality that nearly always accompanies true genius—that of great clearness.

Testimony of Einhard to the clearness of his instruction.

On this point we can require no more competent or satisfactory testimony than Einhard's. That eminent statesman, soon after Charles' death, embraced the monastic profession; and, though warmly attached to Lewis, withdrew, as troubles multiplied, from state affairs into retirement at Seligenstadt. Thither he had already transported the relics of St. Peter and St. Marcellinus, and had changed the name of the town (thus blessed in its new treasure) from Mulinheim to that which it now bore. Seligenstadt was not far distant from Fulda, and Einhard's only son, Vussin, was sent to be educated under Rabanus. It was shortly after his admission into the monastery that he received from his father a letter, still extant, impressing upon him the advantages placed within his reach. 'Wherefore, my son,' writes Einhard, 'strive to follow the example of the good, and on no account incur the displeasure of him whom I have exhorted you to take for your model; but, mindful of your vow, seek to profit by his teaching with the utmost degree of application that he may approve. For, thus instructed, and reducing what you have learned to practice, you will be wanting in nothing that relates to the knowledge of life. And, even as

I exhorted you by word of mouth, be zealous in study, and fail not to grasp at whatever of noble learning you may be able to *gain from the most lucid and fertile genius of this great orator*.'[1]

Testimonies of Church writers to his merits.

The Church and posterity have not been forgetful of the claims of Rabanus to their grateful remembrance. Rudolfus, his able successor in the monastery school, styles him 'a distinguished scholar, and second, as a poet, to none of his time.'[2] 'He was the first,' says Trithemius, 'who taught Germans to speak the Latin and Greek tongues.' To Baronius he appears as *fulgentissimum sidus*; to Bellarmine as *aeque doctus et pius*.[3]

His activity as a founder.

To signal ability as a teacher and merit as a writer, Rabanus added no small achievements as a founder. At the time of his election as abbat, no less than sixteen monasteries and nunneries, either founded by former abbats or affiliated at their own desire, already looked up to Fulda as their parent house. To these Rabanus added six more,—those at Corvey, Solenhofen, Celle, Hersfeld, Petersberg, and Hirschau; we may accordingly reckon twenty-two societies wherein his authority would be regarded as law, and his teaching be faithfully preserved. But even these numerous foundations represent but a fraction of his real influence. Rightly to estimate the range of that influence, we must pass in review the men whom he educated, and who, scattered over the different parts of the severed empire as bishops or teachers, upheld long after his death the cause of religion and of letters. The most eminent of their number was undoubtedly Lupus Servatus, whose character and career will claim a separate chapter. Another, whose name is frequently to be met with in the literature of these

His pupils:

[1] Einhard (ed. Teulet), ii 45–6.

[2] '. . . sophista et sui temporis poetarum nulli secundus.' Pertz, i 364. '"Sophistae," inquit sanctus Augustinus (lib. 2), appellantur, "Latinarum litterarum eloquentissimi auctores."' Ducange, s. v. So in the epitaph of John Scotus, 'Conditur hoc tumulo sanctus sophista Joannes.' Christlieb, p. 47. Hauréau (*Phil. Scholast.* p. 142) infers, somewhat strangely, from the language of Rudolfus, that Rabanus was known as 'le Sophiste!'

[3] *Proleg.* Migne, cvii 106–26.

CHAP. III.

Walafrid Strabo;

times, was Walafrid Strabo. His earlier education was gained at the monastery of Reichenau on the shores of lake Constance, where, as at the sister foundation of St. Gall, the teaching of Columban and the Irish school was still handed down with considerable success. From Reichenau Walafrid was sent to receive further instruction at Fulda—a fact that would lead us to infer, either that the rivalry between the Celtic and the Latin theologians did not altogether prevent friendly intercourse, or that the reputation of Rabanus' teaching was sufficiently great to overcome such jealousies. Walafrid returned after a time to Reichenau, and in the year 842 was elected abbat. But though he had learned much at Fulda, he does not appear to have acquired Rabanus' art as an administrator; and while learning flourished at Reichenau the affairs of the monastery were suffered to fall into irremediable confusion. The verses are still extant in which Walafrid bewails to his former teacher the state of the society, and begs of him the gift of a pair of shoes.[1] Walafrid, not improbably, inherited from Rabanus something of the latter's taste and skill in versification, for he was distinguished as a poet in his day; but his name was chiefly known to the Middle Ages as that of the author of the widely popular *Glossa Ordinaria*, a series of biblical expositions founded upon the lessons of his instructor at Fulda.

Otfried of Weissenberg;

To the influence of Rabanus may perhaps also be referred the far better known efforts of the muse of Otfried, a member of the monastery of Weissenberg in Elsass, and the author of *Der Krist*. The pious monk had often listened to the strains of the strolling singers of his native country, and been scandalised at their coarseness; he aspired accordingly to direct the characteristic talent of his countrymen into happier channels. Hence his well-known production—a metrical harmony of the Gospels in the old High German dialect, the prototype of the lyric in Teutonic literature.

Rudolfus.

More famous in his day than perhaps any of the foregoing was Rabanus' pupil and successor as instructor of

[1] *Opera*, vi 231.

CHAP. III.

the monastery school, the historian Rudolfus, the continuator of the *Annales Fuldenses* from the point where Einhard dropped the pen—a preacher whose oratory was the special delight of Lewis the Pious—a scholar notable for his knowledge of Tacitus (probably from some manuscript that subsequently disappeared) in an age when that writer was otherwise unknown.

Names of minor note crowd on the attention of the student, and almost justify the assertion of one of Rabanus' biographers, that wherever, be it in peace or in war, in the Church or in State, a prominent actor appears at this period, we may almost predict beforehand that he will prove to have been a scholar of this great teacher.[1] Among them we may note Liutpert, abbat of the newly founded society at Corvey, to whom that society was indebted for much of its subsequent reputation—Hartmuat, who at St. Gall restored and long maintained the discipline which had there fallen into decay—Meginhard, who, with strong Teutonic sympathies and a marked increase of historic power, carried on the work of Einhard and Rudolfus—Probus, whose saintly virtues made Fulda yet more illustrious,[2] a gentle scholar who pleaded the claims of Cicero and Vergil to rank among the elect—Ermoldus, author of the lives of St. Sola and St. Hariolf.

Liutpert, Hartmuat, Meginhard, Probus, Ermoldus.

While the services of Rabanus to his generation were thus eminent and indisputable, it is to be regretted that anxiety to adorn a later movement with the sanction of a great name should have led certain writers to claim for him a distinction at variance with his entire reputation—the parentage of the nominalistic controversy. It was in his researches among the MSS. of Abelard and his disciples, preserved in the Imperial Library in Paris, that the late M. Cousin discovered a commentary on Boethius, which, on the doubtful authority of a marginal gloss, he ventured

Difficulties involved in the theory that Rabanus was the author of the gloss discovered by Cousin.

[1] Spengler, p. iv.

[2] '. . . cujus casta conversatio et doctrinae sanctae studium Mogontinam illustravit ecclesiam.' *Annal. Fuld.* ann. 859, Pertz, i 373.

CHAP. III.

to attribute to Rabanus.[1] It is right to add that his conclusion has received the support of M. Hauréau. According to this assumption, Rabanus, in addition to his other distinguished claims, appears as the author of a profound and able refutation of the reality of Universals. Unfortunately, however, two material facts, since pointed out by Kaulich and Prantl, seem fatal to such an hypothesis. Rabanus was already sixty-seven years of age when, in 844, he composed his treatise *De Universo*, in which, as we have before stated,[2] he follows Alcuin in dividing logic into dialectic and rhetoric; but in the manuscript in question logic is subdivided into grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic—a far from unimportant difference and one which Prantl does not hesitate to refer to the influence of the views put forth by John Scotus respecting the relation of grammar and rhetoric to dialectic.[3] Again, it is evident that the commentary is designed as a reply to certain realistic doctrines, and, apart from the controversy raised by John Scotus, we have no evidence that this famous controversy was agitated in Frankland before the second half of the ninth century. But the arrival of John in Frankland belongs to the years 840–6, during which time Rabanus, as we shall shortly see, was leading a life of religious seclusion, and tranquilly composing his *De Universo*, in perfect ignorance, it may be presumed, of that new conception of logic which was being expounded at the court of Charles the Bald. It seems accordingly in the highest degree improbable that either at this period or in the years of his extreme old age, when busied with the duties of his episcopate and the refutation of Gotteschalk, he should have permitted himself to become involved in a sharp philosophical controversy, have reconsidered his classification of the arts and sciences, and composed a treatise altogether dissimilar to anything to be found in his acknowledged writings.[4] The commentary in question was probably

[1] An account of this gloss will be found in the author's *History of the University of Cambridge*, pp. 50–4.

[2] See supra, p. 87.

[3] *Gesch. d. Logik*, ii 38.

[4] 'Allerdings lässt sich nicht direct beweisen, dass Hrabanus denselben

CHAP. III.

the work of a disciple or of some writer who had received his education at Fulda.

His sympathies as a politician.

During the unhappy struggle which preceded the dissolution of the empire, Rabanus espoused the cause of the emperor against the sons. In this policy he was opposed to Otgar, the archbishop, a zealous and ambitious partisan, with aims very different from those of the peace-loving abbat, intent solely on the interests of religion and the Church. While Otgar urged on the war, Rabanus quoted examples from Scripture calculated to recall the unfilial princes and disloyal nobility to their duty and allegiance; and while the former, under the guise of zeal for the Church's laws, took an active part in the cruel deposition of Lewis at Soissons, the other openly maintained the invalidity of the proceedings. After the emperor's death, Rabanus attached himself to the party of Lothair, and his loyalty to that monarch remained unshaken. The results that followed upon the battle of Fontenay were, however, felt by him as a severe blow; and, having resigned his abbatship, he retired, as Baugulfus had done before him, into religious seclusion.[1] He chose for his retreat the cell at Petersberg, and there, to quote the expression of Rudolfus, devoted himself to the study of 'heavenly philosophy,'[2]—that is, in more prosaic language, there compiled his *De Universo* (a feeble though laborious reproduction, with some additions, of the Encyclopaedia of Isidorus); wrote also, at the request of the emperor Lothair, his commentary on Ezekiel;[3] and further, at the request of Lewis the German, an exposition of the 'allegorical' sense of the hymns used in the services of the Church. The relations which he appears to have maintained,

His loyalty to Lewis the Pious and Lothair.

He retires to Petersberg.

His writings while in retirement.

unmöglich verfasst haben könne, aber als sehr unwahrscheinlich müssen wir es immerhin bezeichnen.' *Ibid.* 'Der Gegensatz von Nominalisten und Realisten beginnt sich zwar im neunten Jahrhundert zu entwickeln, aber ihn bis auf Rabanus auszudehnen erscheint uns unrechtfertigt.' Kaulich, *Gesch. d. Schol. Phil.* i 62–3.

[1] See Dümmler, pp. 171, 301.

[2] Rudolfus, *De Reliquiis*, p. 249: '. . . ibi manens ac deo serviens caelesti philosophiae vacabat' (quoted by Dümmler, p. 302).

[3] *Opera*, iv 196. It is to be noted that Rabanus pays a high tribute to the 'aviditas multa sciendi et copiose investigandi' exhibited by Lothair.

CHAP. III.

His relations to Lothair and Lewis the German.

at one and the same time, with Lothair and Lewis the German suggest that his reputation was such as almost to render him superior to mere political considerations. His allegiance, as a subject, was given to the new emperor, for whom, a few years later, we find him compiling a collection of homilies; but there can be little doubt that his respect and regard for Lewis must have been of a far more genuine character. During his retirement, his acquaintance with the latter ripened into permanent friendship, and his testimony to this prince's high character is perhaps the least open to suspicion of all the tributes that have survived to the moral virtues of the best of the sons of Lewis the Pious.

He is elected archbishop of Maintz.

On the death of Otgar, the unanimous voice of the Church, the nobility, and the people elected Rabanus to fill the splendid see of Maintz. The sanction of Lewis the German, in whose realm the city had been included in the division agreed upon at Verdun, was gladly given; Rabanus alone hesitated. It was indeed no slight responsibility to assume, at the age of seventy-one, an office which involved the supervision of the spiritual interests of all Germany, the diocese of Cologne alone excepted. Eventually, however, he acceded to the wish of the electors, and for nine years, until his death in 856, discharged the duties of this onerous dignity. Of one of his earliest measures in this capacity—the part which he took in the condemnation of the ultra-predestinarian views of his former disciple Gotteschalk—we shall have occasion to speak in another chapter.

Influence of the episcopal order at this period.

Amid the troubles and disorganisation of these times, Rabanus, in common with the other members of the episcopate, appears as the upholder of law and order, when the civil power was well-nigh helpless. Perhaps at no period in the annals of Western Europe are the bishops of the Church to be found exercising a more remarkable or more considerable influence.[1] Interwoven with the three great movements that characterise the age—the decay of

[1] Observe the language of Charles the Bald's own minister of state:—'Veruntamen *solito more* ad episcopos sacerdotesque rem referunt, ut quocumque divina auctoritas id vertere vellet nutu ipsius, libenti animo praesto adessent.' Nithardus, IV 3; Pertz, ii 669.

the royal power, the rise of feudalism, and the encroachments of the papacy—their action is nearly always appreciable and often decisive of the immediate result. Theodulfus, Agobard, Hincmar, are men whose power in guiding contemporary opinion and the events of their day can scarcely be matched by that of any three laymen of the time; while Rabanus, working through the hearts and minds of his long array of illustrious disciples, surpasses the former two and yields to Hincmar alone.

CHAPTER IV.

LUPUS SERVATUS: OR, THE CLASSICS IN THE NINTH CENTURY.

CHAP. IV.

THE varied and distinguished activity of Rabanus' different disciples in after life might alone serve to suggest that the influences at Fulda were of a far more inspiring character than those of Tours. To one whom he taught, we cannot doubt that his tolerant views respecting classical literature afforded the opportunity for cultivating a taste which developed into a lifelong passion. In Lupus Servatus—for it is of him that we speak—we have the strongest contrast to Alcuin—the one, lapt in wealth and security, intent mainly on enforcing monastic discipline, and narrowing the limits of learning; the other, amid penury, privation and the oft-recurring demands of military service, and the alarms of invasion, attracted, as by a spell, to the literature which Alcuin shunned, and exhibiting an erudition and enthusiasm not unworthy of the scholars of the Renaissance.

Lupus and Alcuin contrasted.

Lupus was born in the diocese of Sens, early in the ninth century, of a noble family, eminent for its devotion both to the cause of religion and to that of letters.[1] He was first sent to be educated at Ferrières, where, since Alcuin's death, the abbatship had passed from Sigulfus to Adelbert, and from Adelbert to Aldricus. At Ferrières he received the usual instruction in the subjects of the *trivium* and *quadrivium*, and from thence, in the year 830, was sent on by Aldricus (who had, in the meantime, been raised to the archbishopric of Sens) to study theology under Rabanus at Fulda. We have already seen that, about this time, Einhard's son, Vussin, was also receiving his education there.

His early education.

His removal to Fulda and education

[1] Nicholas, *Etude sur les lettres de Servat-Loup.* Clermont-Ferrand, 1861.

Einhard often came over from Seligenstadt to see his son, and his attention was attracted to Lupus as a student of more than ordinary promise. He became his literary adviser and instructor, and, during a six years' residence at Fulda, the young monk enjoyed the twofold advantage of being taught by the ablest scholar and the most profound theologian of the time. From Fulda he returned to Ferrières, where he was at once appointed to the office of instructor in grammar and rhetoric.

under Rabanus and Einhard.

For four years Lupus continued to discharge the duties of his post with little interruption from events without, when the death of Lewis the Pious and the treaty of Verdun brought about fresh changes. The double form of the celebrated oath of Strassburg, whereby Lewis and Charles, with their armies, bound themselves to mutual fidelity, typifies the influence at work in the dismembered empire. Modern France appears, dimly emerging from the confusion, separated for ever from the purely Teutonic races, while diverse rule and opposed interests begin to call into existence new national hostilities. Rabanus, as we have before noted, deeply moved by the fate which transferred the temporal allegiance of Fulda to one whom he could not regard as his rightful lord, retired from his abbatship, and his friend Hatto, who had been his fellow-student at Tours, was elected his successor. A like change had already taken place at Ferrières. Odo, who had succeeded Aldricus on the latter's promotion to the archbishopric of Sens, had shewn himself a warm and apparently somewhat indiscreet partisan of Lothair. He was consequently deposed by Charles the Bald, who appointed Lupus in his place. Envy did not fail to attribute to the new abbat a share in his predecessor's disgrace; but from this imputation he would seem to have satisfactorily vindicated himself in a letter which we still possess.[1] The resignation of Rabanus, it will thus be seen, coincided very nearly with Lupus' election; and we find the latter writing on the occasion to his preceptor, and intimating that he would gladly have profited by his advice with respect to his

His return to Ferrières and promotion to the abbatship.

[1] *Epist.* 21; Migne, cxix 470–2.

CHAP. IV.

new duties, but he hears that he is now devoted solely to religious avocations.[1] It is accordingly evident that, though Rabanus and his disciple differed in their political sympathies, their friendship suffered no diminution; and it may be noted as one of the brighter features of the monastic life of this period, that communities bound by widely different ties and interests still often maintained their friendly intercourse unbroken. It is but a few years later, at the very time that national hostility towards Charles was finding such unmistakeable expression at Fulda at the hand of Rudolfus in the *Annales*, that Lupus, whose loyalty to his monarch admits of no question, is to be found writing to Hatto, the abbat, in terms which imply continued and habitual interchange of good offices.[2]

Intercourse between monastic communities at this period.

Charles the Bald.

With the accession of Charles the Bald, the influences that affected learning had undergone a further modification. In his sympathies towards men of letters, the new monarch resembled his grandfather rather than his saintly sire. His fine lofty forehead, destitute of the flowing locks which usually adorned the Frankish noble, bespoke intellectual powers of no common order. Himself an acute metaphysical theologian, he delighted to pitt opponent against respondent over some knotty *quaestio*. His metrical compositions obtained and deserved a place in the Gallican liturgies. He fostered literature with a care to which we are indebted for more than one important chronicle of contemporary history, while his court was the resort of men of letters of every school. His enemies, who could not deny his mental ability, represented him as unfit for action and cowardly in war—a description scarcely borne out by the facts of his career.

His literary sympathies.

Difficulties that attended his reign.

Under happier circumstances, we can hardly doubt that Charles would have rendered still more enduring services to letters, but his lot was cast in evil days. Aquitaine rose in insurrection, while on the coasts a yet more formidable

[1] 'Caeterum audivi sarcinam administrationis vestrae vos deposuisse et rebus divinis solummodo nunc esse intentos, Hattoni vero nostro curam sudoris plenam reliquisse.' *Epist.* 40.

[2] *Epist.* 86.

danger appeared. The sagacity of Charles the Great had discerned the gathering storm in the North, but so long as he lived the black cloud was still in the remote horizon. The Danish sails hovered off the Frankish coast, but the pirate descended not, held back, as it would seem, by the glamour of that mighty name. In the reign of Lewis, however, Friesland was more than once exposed to their ravages; while the first year of the reign of Charles the Bald saw Rouen plundered and burnt, and the monasteries along the valley of the Seine deserted or rifled of their treasure.[1] Rarely from that time was the kingdom free from their actual presence or the anticipation of their approach. Over the lands that lay between the Rhine and the Scheldt, between the Scheldt and the Loire, between the Loire and the Garonne, the tide of invasion poured in countless successive waves. The monasteries, from sheer necessity, became the centres of organised resistance. From peaceful mansions surrounded by smiling gardens, they gradually assumed the aspect of inhospitable fortresses begirt by moats and palisades. The chronicles of all the foundations in the diocese of Paris, those of the societies at Nantes and Fontenelle (of which a few fragments still exist), the entire collection at Jumièges, irrevocably disappeared from the possession of the historian, and their loss still baffles every attempt to construct a continuous and connected narrative of this period.[2]

The invasions of the Northmen.

Such were the times that embrace the career of Lupus Servatus. He twice saw Paris besieged and taken—once within two years of his election to the abbatship, and again a few years before his death. Ferrières was among the monasteries bound to furnish men and money to the state,[3] and Lupus was himself compelled to bear arms under Charles. It was in vain that he besought Hincmar to obtain his

Lupus in his career as a soldier.

[1] '. . . omnia monasteria seu quaecumque loca flumini Sequanae adhaerentia aut depopulati sunt, aut multis acceptis pecuniis territa relinquunt.' Pertz, i 437.

[2] Palgrave, i 421.

[3] The monastery is included among those 'quae dona et militiam facere debent,' in the *Constitutio de Servitio Monachorum* of 817. Pertz, *Legg.* i 223.

CHAP. IV.

exemption from services for which he was in no way qualified, being, as he urged, ignorant of the art of fence, and an unskilful rider. In the year 844 he was forced to take part in the expedition against the rebels of Aquitaine, and at the battle of Angoulême fell into the hands of the enemy. It was only through the intervention of Turpio, count of Angoulême, that, after a month's captivity, he was restored to the society at Ferrières. To that society his services as an administrator were of incalculable benefit; nor shall we easily find, in mediaeval times, a better example of the extent to which the scholar's life might be made compatible with diplomatic service to the state, and fidelity to monastic interests be reconciled with a lively sympathy in the progress of events without.

Confiscations of monastic lands by the nobility.

The troubles arising from invasion and civil war were not the only sources of disquiet with the monasteries at this time. The nobles, availing themselves of the weakness of the supreme power, began to assert feudal claims, and the confiscating policy of Charles Martel was revived. The more powerful lords disdained all subterfuge, and seized the monastic lands on no other plea than that of the stronger arm. Others forged title-deeds in their own favour, or intrigued at court to gain the royal sanction for their pretended rights. In the correspondence of Lupus we can follow the details of the contest which he was thus compelled to wage in defence of his own monastery. Foremost among the grievances under which the community laboured was the alienation of the revenues derived from the cell of St. Judoc, near Etaples.[1] Alcuin's cell had been bestowed on the monastery by Lewis the Pious, at the request of the empress Judith; it was now given by Charles, shortly after his accession, to count Odulf, a favourite of queen Irmintrude. The repeated representations of the monks of Ferrières had at last convinced the monarch of the injustice of his act, but could gain from him only a conditional promise of restitution. It is at this juncture that we find Lupus, emboldened by the sufferings and destitution of his monastery, submitting to

St. Judoc taken from Ferrières.

[1] See *supra*, p. 134.

CHAP. IV.

the king the following statement of the condition of affairs at Ferrières :—

Remonstrance of Lupus with Charles.

'For three years,' he says, 'the servants of God, whose prayers are ever offered up on your Majesty's behalf, have ceased to receive the garments formerly distributed among them, according to custom; those which they are obliged to wear being now worn out and tattered. They live on vegetables, which they are compelled to purchase, and it is rarely that they eat fish or cheese. Their servants, also, fail to receive the garments to which they are entitled, all these things having been formerly supplied by the cell of St. Judoc. There, too, the care formerly shewn for travellers from beyond the seas, and for the poor, is at an end: the service of God is neglected. I pray that He may not visit these offences on you! Besides the general distress and the cares belonging to my office, I find myself overwhelmed with shame; for in truth, whatever former abbats have gained for the support of our community, that I find myself losing, as though I were the most unworthy and useless of all. I am supported solely by the hope of seeing that which has been lost restored; for God is my witness, my conduct towards your Majesty has not been such as to merit this loss; and, moreover, you have made me a promise which you cannot fail to keep.'[1]

Language of the Council of Thionville.

At the Council of Thionville, in the year 844, the whole question with respect to such confiscations was strongly pressed upon the attention of the three princes (Lothair, Lewis, and Charles) by the assembled bishops, who protested against the spoliation of the monasteries as 'contrary to all authority and reason and to the practice of preceding kings,' and respectfully urged that 'the things which[2] were

[1] *Epist.* 71. Compare the language of the Council of Verneuil in the same year,—'in locis sanctis, hoc est monasteriis, alios studio, nonnullos desidia, *multos necessitate victus et vestimenti*, a sua professione deviare comperimus.' Pertz, *Legg.* i 384. The resolutions of this council were drawn up by Lupus. See *Epist.* 42.

[2] Sacrum quoque monasticum ordinem . . . et quaedam etiam loca specialius venerabilia, contra omnem auctoritatem et rationem, ac patrum vestrorum seu regum praecedentium consuetudinem, laicorum curae et

CHAP. IV.

Caesar's should be given to Caesar,'—Caesar, of course, typifying the monastic interest. Charles, indeed, if we may credit the testimony of Prudentius of Troyes, at nearly the same time, was really *ecclesiae strenuissimus cultor*;[1] but he shrank from a collision with the growing power of his nobility, and in the case of Ferrières restitution was still delayed.

Services of Lupus to the State.

During all this time, Lupus is frequently to be found in attendance at court. His skilful pen and rare attainments enabled him to render important services when questions of ecclesiastical or state policy were in course of agitation. In 847 we find him accompanying Charles to Marsna, for the purpose of assisting in the settlement of terms of peace with Lothair and Lewis. In 849 he appears representing Charles, in connexion with certain Church matters, at Rome; and again, in the same year, at Bourges, as his deputy in the conference held in connexion with the heresy of Gotteschalk. In the year 858 he is employed to negotiate terms with Lewis the German.[2]

Tardiness in the work of restitution.

That so influential an advocate should have been unable to obtain simple justice for his own monastery, shews the strength of the opposing element. The circumstances remind us, by a singularly close resemblance, of bishop Fisher, pleading at the court of Henry VIII on behalf of the despoiled college of St. John at Cambridge. Nearly six years appear to have passed away before we find the abbat of Ferrières writing to archbishop Wigmund at York, and announcing that the cell of St. Judoc had been restored to its rightful owners.[3]

His services to the Church.

The correspondence of Lupus with the leaders of the Church in his day proves the esteem in which his attainments were held. It is scarcely an exaggeration, when Nicholas describes him as one who for two-and-twenty

potestati in maximo; vestro periculo et illorum perditione . . . vos commisisse dolemus.' Pertz, *Legg.* i 381.

[1] *Annales*, Pertz, i 443.

[2] Nicholas, pp. 14–15.

[3] 'Quae tandem aliquando nobis reddita est' (Migne, cxix 526). This was in the year 847.

years was the 'interprète obligé de leurs décisions' in the synods and councils. His last appearance in this capacity belongs to the year 862, when he drew up the sentence pronounced at the Synod of Pistes against Robert, archbishop of Mans, and his death probably took place about the same time.

Probable date of his death.

The foregoing facts in his career have, it will be admitted, no small relevancy to an enquiry into the conditions under which education in Frankland was carried on at this period, but their main value is in the strong relief in which they bring out a devotion to letters, and more especially to classical literature, as intense and as disinterested as that of Petrarch, Casaubon, or Bentley.

In the midst of the cares and duties inseparable from a faithful discharge of a laborious office—amid the unceasing dread of barbaric invasion, and even in the panic that attended its actual occurrence—surrounded by a constant scene of suffering and oppression—Lupus Servatus still found the leisure to pore over the page of Cicero and Quintilian, of Terence and Vergil, with an ardour and concentration worthy of the most unruffled seclusion. He loved letters, by his own confession, not for the fame they might bring, but for the tranquil pleasures they conferred and the loftier moral tone they were calculated to awaken in the individual.[1] Realising more fully than any of his contemporaries the Aristotelian notion, that the end of all acquirement is not so much a *γνῶσις* as a *πρᾶξις*, he found in the pursuit of knowledge the surest distraction from worldly calamities and the best alleviation of trial.

His devotion to letters and exalted conception of their use.

His most frequent topic of complaint is not the troubles of the times or even those of his own monastery, but the paucity and costliness of books. And here, doubtless, he is well entitled to the sympathy of every student, although it is difficult altogether to dismiss the impression that the poor abbat of Ferrières in his untiring and tantalising search

[1] 'Etenim plerique ex ea cultum sermonis quaerimus: et paucos admodum reperias qui ex ea morum probitatem, quod longe conducibilius est, proponant addiscere.' *Epist.* 35. Migne, cxix 502.

CHAP. IV.

after different authors, was often far happier than many a modern scholar surrounded by ease and plenty and a surfeit of vast libraries, and sadly conscious that 'much learning is a weariness of the flesh.'

His literary correspondence.

No other correspondence, for centuries, reveals such pleasant glimpses of a scholar's life, or better illustrates the difficulties which attended its pursuit. The death of his friend and adviser, Einhard, which occurred in 839, before Lupus was raised to the abbatship, must have been felt by him as no ordinary loss. After his return to Ferrières, we find him thus writing to his revered Mentor: 'I am coming to see you,' he says, 'to bring you back your books and to ascertain from you which I am likely to need. I should have sent you Aulus Gellius, only the abbat' [Odo] 'has kept it on the plea that he has not yet had it transcribed, but he has promised to write to explain that he has forcibly deprived me of the volume.'[1] It is to the same friendly counsellor that he laments the small estimation in which learning is again held. Under 'the most illustrious emperor, Charles,' he admits that a great revival had taken place. The saying had been verified, *Honos alit artes et accenduntur omnes ad studia gloria.* 'But now,' he goes on to say, 'those who seek to gain a little knowledge are scarcely tolerated. The ignorant vulgar eye them as though they occupied a pedestal; and if, by mischance, they lay themselves open to criticism, their faults are attributed not to human weakness but to some inherent defect in their studies. And hence, either not caring to win the palm of wisdom or fearing to compromise their reputations, they abandon a really noble pursuit.'[2]

He deplores the spirit in which learning is regarded by the majority.

His perseverance in the search for books.

It is suggestive of the caution requisite against inferring from the evidence for a few isolated instances of scholarly activity the existence of wide-spread culture, that the foregoing passage belongs to the very correspondence in which we find the most frequent proofs at this period of literary taste and learned intercourse. Lupus himself appears as an energetic borrower, though somewhat wary lender, of books.

[1] *Epist.* 5. [2] *Epist.* 1.

When he apprehended the refusal of a loan, he worked through friends. Thus he begs his relative Marcward to send to Fulda a dexterous monk (*solertem aliquem monachum*) who will ask the abbat, Hatto, for a copy of Suetonius to transcribe.[1] 'It is in two moderate-sized volumes,' he adds, 'which you can yourself bring, or should you be unable to come, can send by a trusty messenger.' With the archbishop of Tours he makes interest for the commentaries of Boethius on the *Topica* of Cicero—a loan with respect to which he promises to observe the utmost secrecy.[2] When St. Judoc had been restored to the monastery, he takes advantage of the event to beg from the community at York, on behalf of the foundation over which Alcuin had watched, copies of Jerome's Questions on the Old and New Testaments, those by Bede, and the Institutions of Quintilian.[3] Similarly, when two of the monks at Ferrières set out for Rome, he sends with the letter of recommendation a petition to Benedict III for copies of Jerome on Jeremiah ('from the sixth book to the end'), Cicero *De Oratore*, and Quintilian; they already, he explains, possess certain portions of these authors, but are anxious to have them complete. A copy of Donatus on Terence would be an additional favour, and his Holiness may rely on their prompt return.[4] Sometimes he was much perplexed by requests for loans from quarters which he could not trust; and on one occasion he announces his resolve, in order to evade a troublesome application, to send a certain volume out of the way for safety (*ablegandum illum aliquo, ne perire contingeret, pene statui*).[5]

Literary criticisms.

The literary activity revealed is not less interesting, accompanied, as it sometimes is, by a passing criticism. Caesar, he takes occasion to inform one correspondent, is not the author of the History of the Romans. 'His only extant work,' he says, 'is the Commentaries on the Gallic War.[6] It was his secretary, Hirtius, who undertook to

[1] *Epist.* 91. [2] *Epist.* 16. [3] *Epist.* 62.
[4] *Epist.* 20. [5] *Epist.* 37.
[6] Commentarii belli Gallici, quorum ad vos manavit opinio, tantum exstant.' Migne, cxix 505.

CHAP. IV.

add to the Commentaries the narrative of Caesar's other wars, at a time when his master was absorbed in the affairs of the world.' Sometimes he begs the loan of a manuscript in order to correct another in his own possession. He thanks Adelgard for correcting a Macrobius. He promises another friend to collate a copy of the Letters of Cicero with his own copy, and at the same time asks to borrow Cicero's translation of Aratus, in order to fill up certain *lacunae* in a manuscript of his own which his friend Egilius has pointed out to him. From one incidental notice he would appear to have interested himself in the restoration of the use of the uncial character, which at this time had nearly disappeared. The following list of authors, quoted or referred to in his letters, includes nearly every classical writer known or studied in his time. Among the historians we find Livy,[1] Sallust,[2] Caesar,[3] Suetonius,[4] and Justin;[5] in rhetoric, Cicero[6] and Quintilian;[7] the poets Vergil,[8] Horace,[9] Terence,[10] and Martial;[11] the grammarians Aulus Gellius,[12] Macrobius,[13] Priscian,[14] Donatus,[15] Servius,[16] and Caper:[17]

Enumeration of classical authors that appear to have been known to him.

[1] 'Illud quod sequitur tangere nolui donec in Livio vigilantius indagarem.' *Epist.* 34.

[2] 'Catilinarium et Jugurthinum Sallustii nobis offerre dignemini.' *Epist.* 104.

[3] 'Ejusdem Julii Caesaris Commentarios ut primum habere potuero vobis dirigendos curabo.' *Epist.* 37.

[4] *Epist.* 91.

[5] 'Refert Pompeius Trogus Mithridatis regis futuram excellentiam cometa praemonstratam.' *Epist.* 20.

[6] *Epist.* 1, 8, 20, 34, 46, 62, 69, 103, 104.

[7] 'Petimus etiam Tullium de Oratore et duodecim libros Institutionum Oratoriarum Quintiliani.' *Epist.* 103.

[8] *Epist.* 4, 6, 20, 34, 37, 44.

[9] 'Horatianum illud doctissimorum ore tritum merito accipiam.' *Epist.* 1, 64.

[10] 'Pari intentione Donati Commentum in Terentium flagitamus.' *Epist.* 103.

[11] 'Item apud Martialem: "Quid tibi cum fiala ligulam committere posses."' *Epist.* 20.

[12] 'A. Gellium misissem nisi rursus illum abbas retinuisset.' *Epist.* 5.

[13] 'Habeo vero tibi plurimas gratias quod in Macrobio corrigendo fraternum adhibuisti laborem.' *Epist.* 8.

[14] *Epist.* 8, 34.

[15] *Epist.* 103.

[16] 'Namque quod alia (verba) penultimam primae vel secundae personae producant, auctor est Servius.' *Epist.* 8, 5, 15.

[17] *Epist.* 20.

with the text-books to which we have already referred as the manuals of the period, it is scarcely necessary to say that he shews the usual familiarity.

Difficulties and dangers that attended his efforts.

Even in the midst of details like these, which seem to transport us to another age, the troublous character of the times will now and then intrude. We find him refusing the loan of a book to a monk of Sens, short as was the distance from Ferrières, on the ground that his messenger is travelling on foot. He excuses himself to Hincmar from lending a copy of the *Collectaneum* of Bede, on the plea that 'the volume is too large to be hidden in the vest or in the wallet, and, even if that were possible, the bearer might possibly fall in with a band of robbers who would certainly be tempted by the beauty of the manuscript.'[1] At Ferrières itself there was little sense of security. 'If you knew the situation of our monastery,' he writes to the abbat of St. Martin of Tours, 'you would not have thought of entrusting your treasures to our keeping, I will not say for long, but even for three days. For though access hither may not appear easy for these pirates . . . yet the monastery is so little protected by its situation, and we have so few men capable of opposing them, that this itself is a temptation to their greed.'[2]

Influence of his classical studies discernible.

The beneficial influence of his favourite studies on his habits of thought may be discerned in his distaste for unprofitable speculation on theological questions that admitted of no solution. When Gotteschalk, as yet uncondemned for heresy, consulted him on a difficulty of this character, he replied by advising him not to fatigue his mind with such questions, lest, in becoming over-absorbed in their investigation, he should thus expend the strength needed for more useful enquiries.[3] His intellect, disciplined by contact with the robust sense of the Roman writers, shrank with healthy aversion from such sterile and interminable discussions; and when in his *Liber de Tribus Quaestionibus* he strove to set at rest the controversies then raging on the subjects of predestination, freewill, and the atonement, it was simply to

[1] *Epist.* 76. [2] *Epist.* 110. [3] *Epist.* 80.

CHAP. IV.

cite the Scriptural passages bearing on these questions and to append to them the decisions of the Fathers.

Certainly the eye is gladdened as, in traversing a gloomy century, it encounters this bright gleam of classic taste and the antique spirit. At a time when the Northmen were ravaging the western provinces and carrying fire and sword along the fertile valleys of the Seine and the Loire, when the wolves were prowling in countless numbers through half-depopulated Aquitaine, when whatever intellectual vigour that was apparent expended itself chiefly in a fantastic tampering with Scripture or in fierce theological debate, we turn with relief to one oasis in the desert, fragrant with the perfumes of Parnassus, verdant with the Castalian spring.

CHAPTER V.

JOHN SCOTUS ERIGENA: OR, THE IRISH SCHOOL.

CHAP. V.

We lose all sight of Clement of Ireland after the time of Charles the Great, and it is probable that during the reign of Lewis the Pious the Irish school of philosophy received but little encouragement at court. But in the reign of Charles the Bald a new impulse was given to learning by the united influence of the royal example and the appearance of a notable thinker in Frankland.

Observation of Thomas Gale.

It was observed by an eminent scholar of the seventeenth century that John Scotus Erigena appeared to have been born subject to a strange fatality, whereby men's judgement on him was destined to be always changing.[1] The numerous attempts at elucidating his philosophy and his character that have been made since the days of Thomas Gale do not tend to impair the justice of this observation. In the criticisms by Maurice, Milman, Staudenmaier, St. René Taillandier, Christlieb, Kaulich, Hauréau, and Huber, the view of each writer differs, in some important respect, from the views of nearly all the rest.[2] To essay the task of deciding among these different authorities, would be to enter upon a very lengthened and minute enquiry quite beyond the province of these pages; but, while omitting all discussion

John Scotus the connecting link between preceding schools of learning and the scholastic philosophy.

[1] 'Eo fato mihi natus fuisse Joannes videtur, ut hominum de se judicia semper alternantia subiret.' Thomas Gale, Pref. to *De Div. Nat.*, 1681.

[2] Maurice, *Mediaeval Philosophy*, pp. 45-79; Milman, iv 330-5; Staudenmaier, *J. Scotus Erigena und die Wissenschaft seiner Zeit*, 1833; Taillandier, *Scot Erigène et la philosophie scholastique*, 1843; Christlieb, *Leben und Lehre des Johannes Scotus Erigena*, 1860; Kaulich, *Geschichte der scholastischen Philosophie*, vol. i, 1863; Hauréau, *Philosophie Scholastique*, c viii; Huber (J. N.), *Joh. Scotus Erigena*, 1861.

CHAP. V.

of much that is ambiguous and obscure, it will at the same time not be difficult to point out with reasonable certainty the general character of John's influence as a thinker. Of this the main importance and significance are to be found in the fact, that that influence forms the connecting link between the traditions which have occupied our attention in the preceding pages and the great subsequent developement known as the scholastic philosophy. By some, indeed, John Scotus has been regarded as himself the inaugurator of that philosophy,[1] and it is certainly no exaggeration to say that the impetus he gave to speculation, and the manner in which, with far greater boldness than Rabanus, he introduced the employment of dialectic—so that, after having been long regarded as a dangerous and unlawful art, the logic of Aristotle eventually became the recognised weapon for defending the doctrines of the Church—were tantamount to a revolution in the method of theological enquiry.

His birth and early education.

The career of this remarkable man commences and closes in obscurity. There can be little question that he was, as his name implies, an Irishman—'a native of the Holy Isle;'[2] but the year of his birth can be fixed with no greater certainty than between the years 800 and 815. His education, again, was doubtless received in one or other of those famous Irish monasteries which have already claimed our attention—a fact of which his Greek learning and his sympathy with the Celtic tendencies in philosophy and theology are unmistakeable evidence; but the only part of his career respecting which we have any trustworthy information is that of his life in Frankland. It was when he was somewhat more than thirty years of age, probably about the year 845, that John set foot in the realm of Charles the Bald—a still young, enthusiastic, and vigorous thinker, his favourite manual that same treatise by Martianus Capella which the Church so much

[1] e.g. Staudenmaier; Buhle, *Gesch. der Künste und Wissenschaften*, i 823. Hegel, *Vorles. über Gesch. d. Philosophie*, iii 159–161. Ueberweg, *Gesch. d. Philosophie*, i 103–111.

[2] 'Jerugena aber sei eine Zusammensetzung aus ἱεροῦ scilic. *νήσου* und *gena*, nach dem Beispiel von Graijugena, wie Johannes selbst den hl. Maximus benenne.' Huber, p. 39.

mistrusted, he himself well versed in the Greek Fathers, especially Origen, whose genius for philosophic speculation he greatly admired,[1] his whole mental vision, to use the expression of William of Malmesbury, 'concentrated on Greece.'

His reception at the court of Charles the Bald.

Had Lewis the Pious still sat on his father's throne, John's reception at the Frankish court would probably have been of no encouraging character. But the aged emperor, the careful guardian of the traditions of the Church, had been succeeded by his youngest son (of whom John was nearly as much the senior as Alcuin was the senior of Charles the Great), and between the youthful monarch and the young philosopher there at once sprung up an intimacy which appears to have lasted until the former's death. John, when he first attracts our notice in Frankland, had already been appointed teacher of the Palace School.

Character of Charles.

In almost every respect, save in a common love of learning, Charles was a complete contrast to his father, and even in this relation a difference is discernible; for while Lewis' favourite study was the mysteries of Scriptural interpretation, the son delighted in philosophic subtleties. It must, however, be acknowledged that his patronage of learning appears to have included all schools and all parties. He was probably the most liberal benefactor of letters in his time. If we may accept the testimony of Eric of Auxerre, as given in a somewhat fulsome dedication written towards the latter part of Charles' reign, he was 'the stay of schools and studies in well-nigh every land,' 'the cultivators of the most excellent learning had flocked from all quarters to his realm,' so that, as Eric goes on to say, 'your school is rightly styled the Palace School, where the chief daily devotes himself to scholarly no less than to martial exercises.'[2]

His liberal patronage of learning.

Charles' fondness for disputations and the discussion of

[1] '. . . magnum Origenem, diligentissimum rerum inquisitorem.' *De Div. Nat.*

[2] '. . . cunctarum fere gentium scholas et studia sustulisti . . . in eam mundi partem, quam vestra potestas complectitur, universa optimarum artium studia confluxerunt. . . . Ita ut merito vocitetur schola palatium: cujus apex non minus scholaribus quam militaribus consuescit quotidie disciplinis.' *Epist. Dedicat. to Charles the Bald.* Migne, cxxiv 1134.

CHAP. V.

knotty *quaestiones* rendered the Irish scholars, the professed disciples of dialectic, especially welcome at his court. Nor were they slow to avail themselves of his generous hospitality and aid. Impelled partly by penury, partly by the national love of change and adventure, they appear at this period as inundating Frankland. In such numbers did they present themselves as applicants for the charity which it was then held to be a religious duty to extend to the stranger, that hospitals or houses of temporary shelter were erected for their exclusive benefit.[1] The writer above quoted declares that 'nearly all learned Ireland, disdaining the perils of the sea, had sought in voluntary exile to subserve the wishes of one who was a Solomon in wisdom.'[2]

Influx of Irish scholars into Frankland.

Such were the circumstances under which John Scotus appears upon the scene. In strong contrast to Alcuin, he came vacating no well-endowed scholastic chair, entrusted with no dignified ecclesiastical functions, sorely missed from his native land and reluctantly suffered to depart, but rather, to quote his own metaphor, as a storm-tossed voyager anxiously seeking a quiet haven.[3] His attainments, however, were certainly in no respect inferior to Alcuin's, and commanded not only the admiration of friendly critics, but also that of those who had little sympathy with his genius or his opinions. He was a master of clear and terse exposition. He possessed a fairly correct and even elegant Latin style.[4] His knowledge of Greek, which has been variously estimated, may be a matter of some doubt, for his acquaintance with the *Timaeus* of Plato was probably gained through the Latin version of Chalcidius, and he confesses, with the modesty of true genius, that his knowledge of the language is that of a tyro.[5] But as counter-evidence there is the significant fact

Circumstances of John Scotus' arrival contrasted with those of Alcuin's.

His extensive attainments.

[1] 'Hospitalia Scotorum, quae sancti homines gentis illius in hoc regno construxerunt.' Capit. of Synod at Epernay, ann. 846. Pertz, *Legg.* i 390.

[2] 'Quid Hiberniam memorem, contempto pelagi discrimine, pene totam cum grege philosophorum ad littora nostra migrantem; quorum quisquis peritior est, ultro sibi indicit exsilium, ut Salamoni sapientissimo famuletur ad votum.' Migne, cxxiv 1133.

[3] Huber, p. 49.

[4] Ibid. p. 44.

[5] '. . . rudes admodum tirones adhuc helladicorum studiorum fatemur.' Pref. to *Dionysii Hier.*, Huber, p. 43.

CHAP. V.

that he was singled out by his royal patron for a task which, it would seem, no one else had hitherto been able to perform —the translation of the Pseudo-Dionysius.[1] Hauréau calls attention to the Greek title of his most important work. He was, beyond all question, well acquainted with the original of the New Testament,[2] and among the Greek Fathers was familiar with Gregory Nazianzen (whom, however, he appears to have identified with Gregory of Nyssa [3]), with Origen, St. Basil, and St. Chrysostom. If we add to these acquirements a natural subtlety of intellect and aptitude for controversy which indicate a mind of altogether a different stamp from Alcuin's,[4] we shall be ready to admit that in characteristics like these there was alone enough to excite the curiosity and expectation of the learned in Frankland.

His knowledge of Greek.

But to these gifts, inborn and acquired, John Scotus united other qualities still more likely to challenge observation. He exemplified, in a very marked degree, the tendencies of his school—the Celtic proneness to speculation and the Celtic impatience of dogmatic teaching. His high estimate of the value of Martianus Capella is attested by the fact that he compiled a commentary on the treatise, which has recently been brought to light by modern research; from the pages of that author, indeed, he had, in the opinion of Prudentius of Troyes, 'imbibed a deadly poison,'[5]—in less rhetorical phrase, he dared to assert the claims of reason

His Celtic culture.

[1] I must confess my inability to discover the grounds on which one writer rests his assertion, when comparing John's knowledge of Greek literature and Greek philosophy with Alcuin's, that 'as far as mere acquaintance with Greek letters goes there is no question about Alcuin's superiority' (Maurice, *Mediaeval Phil.* p. 46). The facts appear to me to point to exactly the opposite conclusion.

[2] Huber (p. 44) considers that his knowledge of the Old Testament was limited to the version of Jerome.

[3] '. . . venerabilis Gregorius Nazianzenus, qui et Nyssaeus dicitur.' *De Div. Nat.* III 40. Christlieb, p. 118.

[4] Floss confesses that on his first perusal of John's writings he was struck by his wonderful and singular subtlety in argument,—*haud parum me movisse speciosam ac paene singularem disputandi subtilitatem confiteor.* Migne, cxii, i.

[5] Migne, cxv 1294.

CHAP. V.

in opposition to mere authority; while in maintaining the value of dialectic as the special instrument for the investigation of all truth, he took up a position distinctly opposed to the traditions of the Latin Church.

Influence exercised on his mind by the *Timaeus* and the Pseudo-Dionysius.

To these more general grounds of variance must be added another element of difference, and one to which perhaps none of his numerous critics have assigned quite its full weight—we allude to the marked influence exercised on his mind by two very different treaties—the *Timaeus* of Plato and the Hierarchies of Dionysius. In days when real independence of thought was still undreamt of, and the utmost ambition of the boldest thinker was to prove the superiority of one school of ancient doctrine over another, it is scarcely possible to over-estimate the importance of the direction of a scholar's reading. It may, we think, be clearly shewn that by far the greater part of what was most noteworthy and novel in John's philosophy and theology was derived from the above-named sources.

The latter treatise described.

Of the latter treatise it will be better to speak first. It is well known that the patron saint of France, honoured under the name of St. Denys, was alleged to be that same Dionysius the Areopagite who is mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles[1] as among the converts gained by St. Paul after his memorable discourse on Mar's Hill, and who, according to tradition, was the first bishop of Athens. To this Dionysius was also assigned the authorship of a discourse concerning the Celestial and Ecclesiastical Hierarchies, a work which more modern criticism, however, inclines to attribute to the Christian school at Edessa in the latter part of the fifth century.[2] Of this treatise a copy had been sent by pope Paul to Pepin-le-Bref in 757, and a yet more splendid manuscript by the eastern emperor, Michael Balbus, to Lewis the

[1] XVII 34.

[2] The evidence for this conclusion will be found summed up in Mr. Lupton's introduction to his edition of Colet's *Two Treatises on the Hierarchies of Dionysius*, pp. xxxii–xxxviii. See also Canon Westcott's admirable article in *Cont. Rev.* (May, 1867), *Dionysius the Areopagite*. Gieseler (I ii 351, ed. 1845) says that the Dionysian writings 'ohne Zweifel in Aegypten abgefasst waren.'

CHAP. V.

Pious.[1] Such a present could not fail to appeal very forcibly to the superstitious reverence of Frankland, and Hilduin, the abbat of St. Denys, was induced to attempt its translation; but his efforts, which probably much resembled those of the earlier Humanists in the fifteenth century in relation to Homer, were not crowned with success, and the manuscript still reposed in the library of St. Denys, an object of deep though somewhat vague admiration, when John Scotus arrived in Frankland.[2] We can perhaps ask for no better evidence of the superiority of his Greek learning to that of his contemporaries, than the fact that he was forthwith solicited to undertake the task of rendering this work into Latin. The style of the original, which often veils the meaning in language of mystic obscurity, rendered his undertaking one of considerable difficulty. Notwithstanding his speculative and enquiring cast of mind, he possessed nothing of the critical spirit, and the gross anachronisms involved in the assumption of the Dionysian authorship do not appear to have arrested his attention. His main anxiety was to guard against rendering himself liable to the charge of having tampered with the sense, and he accordingly produced a version of almost painful literalness. To use the expression of Anastasius, the papal librarian, his interpretation still needed an interpreter.[3] In other respects, however, the Italian critic is loud in his praise. 'It is astonishing,' he says, 'how this barbarian (*vir ille barbarus*) living on the confines of the world, who might reasonably have been presumed to be as ignorant of Greek as he was remote from intercourse with civilised men, could have been able intellectually to grasp such mysteries and to render them into another language.'[4]

John invited by Charles the Bald to undertake its translation.

Testimony of Anastasius to his success.

[1] Huber, p. 50; Christlieb, p. 26.

[2] Staudenmaier, p. 163.

[3] '. . . et quem interpretaturum susceperat, adhuc redderet interpretandum' (quoted by Christlieb, p. 63).

[4] 'Mirandum est quomodo vir ille barbarus, qui, in finibus mundi positus, quanto ab hominibus conversatione tanto credi potuit alterius linguae dictione longinquus . . . talia intellectu capere in aliamque linguam transferre valuerit' (quoted by Hauréau, p. 153).

CHAP. V.

Influence of the treatise on his philosophy.

The contents and character of the Hierarchies of Dionysius have so often been epitomised and described, as fairly to exonerate us from here attempting an outline of the work. Briefly it may be said that they harmonised in a twofold manner with the spirit of western mediaevalism. They exhibited the different orders of the hierarchy as symbolical of a like order in heaven—a theory especially acceptable to the aspiring spirit of the Latin Church; and they offered to the devotion of the monastic recluse an object of unwearying contemplation, in the doctrine they unfolded of a future union with the Supreme Being, and a final reabsorption into the Divine Nature. In the closing book of John Scotus' *De Divisione Naturae* this latter theory, of an Absolute Existence in which the pure and perfected soul is finally merged and lost, is set forth at considerable length; the late professor Maurice has clearly proved that the writer's inspiration was derived, not from any Neo-Platonic writings, as Guizot supposes, but from the pages of the Pseudo-Dionysius.[1]

The *Timaeus*.

The second treatise, the *Timaeus* of Plato, exercised over the mind of John Scotus a less general but perhaps not less potent influence. It is well known to every scholar that Plato's cosmogony, as unfolded in this dialogue, presents us with a very peculiar view of the guiding power of the universe. Ἀνάγκη, Necessity, the 'erratic, irregular, random, Causality,' is here not simply distinguished from, but opposed to, the Demiurgus, the intelligent formative power. Fate and design, much like the Μοῖραι and the gods of the Greek mythology, are described as antagonistic forces. It is only within certain limits that divine skill, divine design, and divine order, can find effect; beyond those limits lie the operations of a superior force, but a force planless, undetermined, and irregular in its working, *vis consilî expers*. According to this conception, as an eminent critic has clearly pointed out,[2] Necessity, in the Platonic sense, nearly corresponded to the modern theological conception of free will, and was consequently altogether opposed to what Augustine denoted

The Platonic theory not reconcile-

[1] *Mediaeval Philosophy*, pp. 50–55. [2] Grote, *Plato*, iii 248–51.

CHAP. V.

by the term predestination; while as thus understood and accepted by John Scotus, it appeared to him to offer the most philosophical solution of the great problem with respect to which the utterance of Scripture is ambiguous and that of the Fathers at variance.

able with predestinarianism.

To his application and able assertion of this Platonic theory we may probably attribute the fact that John was selected by Hincmar to undertake the refutation of Gotteschalk. He arrived in Frankland at a very favourable juncture for securing that prelate's favour and support; the able and ambitious churchman, far more politician than divine, was sorely in need of an able pen to aid him in the contest in which he was now involved with the other members of the episcopate and a majority of the inferior clergy.

Hincmar invites John to reply to Gotteschalk.

It had been looked upon as a grievous discredit to Fulda, and had been no slight trial to Rabanus, when, in the year 829, one of their number, a young Saxon of noble family of the name of Gotteschalk, had announced his weariness of the monastic life, and obtained from the Synod at Maintz a formal dispensation from his vows. He pleaded that it was only under compulsion that he had ever become a Benedictine, and his plea had been held valid by the Synod on the ground that a Saxon could thus forfeit his freedom only when the ceremony had been attested by a witness of the same nationality. Rabanus, however, subsequently drew up a treatise to prove that pious parents have a right to impose such a sacrifice on their offspring; and urged, with greater force, that all that could be reasonably required in an attesting witness was integrity and credibility without respect to rank or race.[1] His argument was recognised as valid by Lewis the Pious, and the decision of the Synod of Maintz was reversed. Gotteschalk was only permitted to transfer himself from the monastery at Fulda to that of Orbais in the diocese of Soissons. At Orbais he gave himself up to the study of Augustine, and of Augustine's follower, Fulgentius.[2]

Gotteschalk's previous career.

[1] Dümmler, i 311-12. To this able writer's clear and careful narrative I am mainly indebted for the order of events in Gotteschalk's career.

[2] Ibid.

CHAP. V.

Of the latter writer he became so completely the avowed and uncompromising disciple that among his opponents he was commonly known by the same name. He re-asserted, in its harshest and most repellant form, the doctrine of predestination, and was indefatigable in his efforts to bring over to his views the foremost theologians of his day. Among those with whom he corresponded on the subject, were Ratramnus, a monk of Corbey; Jonas, bishop of Orleans; Marcward, abbat of Prum; and, as we have already noticed, the scholarly abbat of Ferrières. The prudent advice given by Lupus Servatus was, however, little to Gotteschalk's mind, conscious as he was of powers which could only find full scope in the field of argument and controversy. At once an eloquent orator and a dexterous debater, with a retentive memory which enabled him to impress an audience with the belief that his knowledge of the Scriptures and the Fathers was unparalleled, he longed for the battle. At length the admission to priestly orders, conferred by Rigbold, the chorepiscopus of Rheims, gave him the opportunity he sought; the admission carried with it the license to preach, and Gotteschalk's oratorical ability soon drew around him numerous followers. His chief, almost his only theme, was the Augustinian doctrine of predestination, upon which he untiringly insisted as the great central truth of Christianity, though obscured by the extent to which it had been suffered to fall into the background in the theological teaching of the age. His opponents, who, while not denying the high authority of Augustine, could accept but a modified form of predestinarianism, were denounced as sectarians who had lapsed from the true faith. In allusion to his former teacher, now his most determined antagonist, he styled them the *Rhabanici*.[1]

His theory of predestination.

Gotteschalk's fundamental conception of the Supreme Being was that of *immutability*,—the Unchangeable in nature,

[1] Dümmler, i 314; 'omnes qui insaniae sensuum tuorum zelo fidei resistunt haereticos appellare non metuis, eosque a bono et erudito viro atque catholico episcopo Rhabanicos nuncupare praesumis.' Amolo Gothescalco, Sirmond, *Opp. Var.* ii 902.

and consequently the Unchangeable in purpose. With such a conception it appeared to him impossible to reconcile the notion that the fate of man depended on his own conduct, and remained, as it were, in suspense until his death. No formal admission to the Church on earth, no sacramental rite, could in the slightest degree avail to save the soul foreordained to perdition. The theory of the freedom of the human will was consequently altogether discarded by him.

In this theory of a divine government which thus reduced all human action to insignificance, of an autocracy which recognised no element of freedom in the moral world, it might at first sight seem not improbable that a Latin clergy would be disposed to detect an analogy to their sacerdotal system, involving, as that system did, habitual and unquestioning submission to authority. It is, however, a fact familiar to the student of Church history, that fatalism in theology has generally been the creed of those who have rebelled most stubbornly against ecclesiastical tyranny,[1] and it is certain that the clergy both in Francia and Germany were divided by Gotteschalk's teaching. Rabanus, who, as we can well understand, had watched the career of his unworthy disciple with little disposition to judge him favourably or leniently, took up his pen to refute the doctrine of predestinarianism with arguments which derived their main force from the consequences to which, as he pointed out, such a doctrine must inevitably lead. This treatise appeared in the year 840, when Gotteschalk had already made numerous converts, not only in Western and Eastern Francia, but also in Italy. In the year 848 he again visited the latter country, and found for a time kindly shelter under the protection of Eberhard, the distinguished count of Friuli. Even here, however, the enmity of his former teacher followed him. Rabanus addressed a letter to Count Eberhard, pointing out the perilous tendencies of the doctrine taught by Gotteschalk; many, he asserted, were, under this influence, falling away from all endeavour to lead a godly life, being persuaded that no efforts would avail to win the divine favour, and that the actions of the individual were

It divides the Frankish theologians.

Gotteschalk strenuously opposed by Rabanus.

[1] See, on this point, Milman's observations, *Lat. Christianity*, iv 329.

CHAP. V.

valueless. He concluded by urging Eberhard not to suffer a teacher of doctrine so injurious to the faith to remain under his roof.[1]

His efforts at propagating his doctrine.

The remonstrances of the powerful archbishop of Maintz were only too successful, and Gotteschalk was compelled to quit the hospitable mansion of Eberhard in disgrace. But his spirit was undaunted, and, taking his course through Dalmatia and Pannonia into Bavaria, he assumed the tone and the language of a reformer, exhorting the people as he went to return to the true faith.[2] Hincmar, when subsequently referring to his conduct on this journey, accused him of having usurped the function of an apostle among a pagan people, and of having thus sown the tares of false doctrine in a virgin soil. From Bavaria Gotteschalk proceeded to Maintz, and of his own accord there presented himself before an assembled Council of the nobility and clergy, and the teacher and his former disciple stood face to face.[3] They maintained their respective grounds; the latter citing numerous passages from Augustine to establish the authority of the tenet he taught, and declaring his readiness personally to attest its truth by submitting to the terrors of a fiery ordeal; the former insisting on the essential heterodoxy of that tenet, and reiterating his objections to the consequences to which such teaching must lead. Rabanus bore hardly on the renegade monk, and pressed his conclusions with the utmost rigour. In the eyes of the pious Lewis the German, who presided at the council, Gotteschalk stood convicted of promulgating doctrine subversive of all popular morality. He was declared a heretic, and, along with many of his adherents who had accompanied him, was sentenced to be publicly scourged. After this order had been executed, he was compelled to swear that he would never again set foot in East Francia, and was finally handed over to Hincmar, in whose diocese the monastery of Orbais lay, for further

His appeal to the Synod of Maintz.

His condemnation and disgrace.

[1] Dümmler, i 316–17.

[2] Prudentius, *Annales*, Pertz, i 443. Gotteschalk here appears sketched by his subsequent ally as 'scientia tumidus, quibusdam superstitionibus deditus.'

[3] Gfrörer, i 214; Dümmler, i 318.

CHAP. V.

punishment. Few will be disposed to call in question the comment of Dümmler, that it was a harsh and unrighteous sentence[1] and leaves a stain on the reputation of Rabanus. Even Staudenmaier admits that the archbishop's conduct was neither merciful nor paternal.

His condemnation at the Council of Chiersy, A.D. 849.

The treatment which Gotteschalk received in the western kingdom, at the hands of Hincmar, was not less rigorous. In the following year, at the famous Council of Chiersy, summoned by Charles the Bald, his doctrine was again condemned, he himself degraded from his priest's orders, and, after having been cruelly scourged, compelled to commit to the flames the confession of faith which he had drawn up and persistently taught. He was then consigned to perpetual imprisonment in the monastery of Hautvilliers. But even here his stern spirit showed itself still unbroken. He declared himself confident that his teaching would yet be vindicated by the divine interposition on his behalf, and once more took up his pen to defend his interpretation of Augustine.[2]

Counter movement in his favour.

His constancy and the excessive severity with which he had been treated roused the sympathy of many on Gotteschalk's behalf. Ratramnus, a monk of Corbey, the able opponent of Paschasius, espoused his side, and set forth his own views in two books, *De Praedestinatione Dei*,[3] which he dedicated to Charles the Bald. Prudentius, bishop of Troyes, together with Amolo and Remigius, successively bishops of Lyons, and Florus, a presbyter of the same city, all rallied to his defence. Even Lupus Servatus, much as he deplored the controversy, laid aside his Cicero and his Quintilian to sum up the evidence of the Fathers and advocate a conclusion that virtually exonerated the prisoner at Hautvilliers from the charge of heresy.[4] With such an array

[1] Dümmler, i 319.

[2] Ibid. i 319–20.

[3] Migne, cxxi 10-11. Ratramnus was not, as Ussher supposes, abbat of Orbais; see Staudenmaier, p. 191.

[4] Migne, cxv 969. Florus, Amolo, and Remigius, maintained the doctrine in a modified form, denying that men were fore-ordained to sin. This has led some writers to suppose that they sided with Hincmar. See Werner (K.), *Gesch. d. apolog. und polem. Literatur*, ii 679–84.

CHAP. V.

of learning Hincmar himself was but very imperfectly qualified to cope. His long and busy public career left him no leisure for theological speculations, and his own endeavour to reply to the arguments of Gotteschalk must rank among the least considerable of his claims to the remembrance of posterity. Under these circumstances, it can be but small matter for surprise that he eagerly availed himself of the aid of the famous teacher recently installed at the Palace School; and all learned Frankland now looked on with new interest as it saw the hard-headed and resolute Saxon matched against the keen intellect and logical adroitness of the brilliant Irishman.

John Scotus *De Praedestinatione.*

The *De Praedestinatione* of John Scotus contains, it is true, no direct allusion to the *Timaeus*, but it is easy to perceive that the conception unfolded in that dialogue militates strongly against the notion of a definite, irresistible, omnipresent purpose working from all eternity. We can understand also how John's theological training would still more directly incline him to that view of the question which was espoused by the Greek Fathers; while in the doctrine which he found set forth in the *Celestial Hierarchy* of the purely negative character of evil,[1] he had an argument which undoubtedly furnished a conclusive reply to the theory of men predestined to perdition.

He employs the aid of dialectic.

The manner in which he addressed himself to the controversy illustrates his native ingenuity and tact. Urgently summoned, as he was, to take part in the conflict, he not unreasonably claimed the right to choose his own weapons, and the one on which he chiefly relied was that of dialectic. Though, as yet, this was still a distrusted weapon with the orthodox party, it had, as we have already seen,[2] recently been sanctioned by the high authority of Rabanus. The *De Institutione Clericorum* was probably by this time in the hands of almost every better educated and more intelligent

[1] Dionysius, *De Divin. Nom.* iv 23, a point with respect to which Mr. Lupton notes that John Colet ventured to differ from his author. See Lupton's *Introd.* p. xlvii.

[2] See supra, p. 144.

ecclesiastic throughout Frankland, and John could point triumphantly to the passage in which the most eminent teacher in East Francia had vindicated the dialectical art as a satisfactory reply to all objectors. The 'Rabanici,' whom Gotteschalk had so acrimoniously assailed, could not but be conciliated by John's appeal to the dictum of their leader.

Religion and philosophy cannot be opposed.

He commences accordingly with the broad assertion—an assertion in which we may discern the nascent theory which constitutes the key to the whole scholastic philosophy—that philosophy and religion can never be really at variance. What then, he asks, are philosophical discussions but an attempt to enquire into the principles of true religion, whereby the Divine Nature, the chief and primary cause of all things, is humbly worshipped and investigated in a manner conformable to reason? Hence it follows that true philosophy is true religion, and conversely that true religion is true philosophy. But reason, he next goes on to demonstrate, requires the employment of definite method.

His fourfold method.

In every *quaestio* four principal stages are necessary to be observed in its solution—those of division, definition, demonstration, and analysis, which he designates under their Greek names, as the *διαιρετική*, the *ὁριστική*, the *ἀποδεικτική*, the *ἀναλυτική*. Then he reproduces almost verbatim the weighty passage from the pen of Rabanus,[1] wherein that eminent authority had insisted upon the unwisdom of depriving the defenders of the faith of all the legitimate weapons of oratory and argument, while their opponents are systematically trained in every art whereby the hearer is conciliated, persuaded and convinced. And with this

[1] The passage 'Ne igitur defensores . . . dormitent' in the *Liber de Praedestinatione* (Migne, cxxii 358–9) will be found to be nearly a transcript of the passage in the *De Institutione Clericorum* cited in note, p. 144. No writer with whom I have met has noted this remarkable adoption from Rabanus. The custom of incorporating passages from other writers without acknowledgement was very common in the ninth century, but in the present instance it may be reasonably inferred that John considered the passage in question to be so familiar to most readers as to render the mention of the author's name unnecessary.

CHAP. V.

passage before him John does not hesitate to avow that the *ars disputatoria* is his chosen weapon.[1]

Features in his treatise that especially evoked opposition.

To this bold avowal we may fairly refer a large portion of the opposition which the *De Praedestinatione* of John Scotus evoked—an opposition undoubtedly augmented by the unpopularity of Hincmar, whom it was designed to aid, and by the sympathy which Gotteschalk's harsh treatment had aroused. But the orthodox party were not only thus called upon to recognise the employment of a new method in the conduct of theological controversy, they were also constrained to listen to appeals to other authorities than Rabanus and the traditional teachers of the Latin Church. Where the Latin Fathers failed him, John boldly appealed to the Fathers of the eastern Church; and where these in turn failed him, he appealed with equal confidence to the philosophers. There was something too of haughty defiance in the tone in which he spoke of the errors of his antagonists. Their blunders, he compassionately observed, were owing to their ignorance, especially their ignorance of Greek, for they were unable in their Latin tongue to understand or express the necessary distinctions of meaning. To fill up the measure of his offence, he referred with undisguised approval to the pages of Martianus Capella.

It is certain that if John had calculated on his specific agreement with Hincmar and the 'Rabanici' to enable him to override the opposition to which indications like these were certain to give rise, he was soon undeceived. The Gallican clergy appear to have risen almost *en masse* against the dictatorship of their metropolitan. The hostility of the Church of Lyons, as exhibited in the treatises of the writers already named, may probably be in some measure referred to the rivalry between two great episcopal centres in two hostile kingdoms;[2] but the vehemence of other writers clearly proves that the contest was waged far more with reference to distinctive views than geographical or

[1] *Lib. de Praedestinatione*, Migne, cxxii 358.

[2] This certainly would seem a more obvious explanation than the somewhat fanciful one supplied by M. Hauréau (p. 178) derived from the different kinds of morality most needed in north and south.

ethnical affinities. The hostility of Fulda, in the kingdom of Louis the German, was rivalled by that of Lyons in the empire of Lothair, while both again were surpassed by that exhibited in the realm of Charles the Bald. The manifesto which most clearly illustrates the relative position of the two parties is undoubtedly the vehement and laboured treatise of the Spaniard, Prudentius, at this time bishop of Troyes. When John first arrived in Frankland he had numbered Prudentius among his friends, but their intimacy had now given place to feelings of a very different character. It is evident indeed that there could at no time have existed much real intellectual sympathy between the two,—rarely are the dogmatist and the rationalist to be seen in stronger contrast.

Prudentius.

At the very commencement of his reply, Prudentius breaks forth into a sweeping denunciation not merely of the dogma which John had defended, but of the whole scope and character of his treatise. He had found in its pages nearly everything he most abhorred and mistrusted,—'the poison of the Pelagian treachery,' 'the folly of Origen,' 'the madness of the Collyrian heresy.'[1] John reminds him, he says, very forcibly of Pelagius. In the manner in which he had assailed the orthodox faith and the Catholic fathers he seemed to have been actuated by exactly the same spirit.[2] Both of them displayed a like foolish predilection for dialectical subtleties; those very subtleties against which the leaders of the Church in former times had, in successive Councils, so wisely set their faces, requiring that the defenders of the truth should have recourse *not to the trickeries of sophistic but to the obvious meaning of Scripture.*[3] As for John's quadruple method of investigation, he avers that neither that nor any

His reply to John Scotus, circ. 853.

[1] '. . . repperi in eis Pelagianae venena perfidiae, et aliquoties Origenis amentiam, Collyrianorumque haereticorum furiositatem.'—*De Praed. contra J. Scotum*, Migne, cxv 1011.

[2] '. . . tanta impudentia orthodoxae fidei Patribusque catholicis oblatrantem ac si unus spiritus Julianum Joannemque docuerit.'—Ibid.

[3] '. . . sancti procul dubio Spiritus incordatione a patribus cautum est ut defensores propugnatoresque simplicis fidei, nequaquam sophisticis illusionibus sed Scripturarum sanctarum evidentissimis allegationibus uterentur.' Ibid. p. 1013.

CHAP. V.

other kind of unsanctified sophistry would avail where the Divine blessing and a genuine knowledge of the Scriptures were lacking.[1] In reply to his antagonist's assumption of superiority on the ground of his classic learning, he adduces Jerome's notable abjuration of Cicero—Jerome, 'who deliberately preferred to understand the Scriptures in their simplicity to becoming versed in the cunning of the rhetoricians,'[2] while John, on the contrary, had supplemented whatever he was unable to find among the Latins by having recourse to the Greeks.[3] Then he falls with unsparing severity upon that odious volume, *ille tuus Capella*, which was generally believed to have been mainly instrumental in leading John into this labyrinth of error. He charges him with having adopted some of the falsities in Varro, falsities which had determined Augustine to cast that author altogether aside, solely because they appeared to agree with what he had found in Martianus.[4]

These treatises of little value in relation to the predestinarian controversy.

Of the value of the whole literature of this controversy it is impossible to speak very highly. The main points at issue were never really grasped, and the dispute degenerated into one of words; while the abysmal question was left unsounded in those depths which other intellects, perhaps not of greater natural power but of severer habits of thought, have since more elaborately essayed. The decisions of the Church itself, at this time, exhibit the same inability fully

[1] 'Nec illud quadrivium, nec ullus mundanae sapientiae species ad omnem quaestionem solvendum sufficere absque gratia Dei et fide, quae per dilectionem operatur, ac veraci studio et sanctarum scientia Scripturarum.' Ibid. p. 1016.

[2] 'Malle per se sanctarum Scripturarum dicta intelligi quam rhetorum controversiis inservire.'—Ibid. p. 1017.

[3] 'Qui, quod in Latinis defecerit, ad Graeca nos retrahit.'—Ibid. p. 1305.

[4] 'Nam ille tuus Capella, exceptis aliis, vel maxime te in hunc labyrinthum induxisse creditur, cujus meditatione magis quam veritati evangelicae animum appulisti. Quin etiam cum legeres beati Augustini libros, quos *De Civitate Dei* adversus paganorum fallacissimas falsissimasque opiniones mirabili affluentia digessit, invenisti eum posuisse ac destruxisse quaedam ex libris Varronis, quibus, quoniam Capellae tuo consona videbantur, potius assentiri quam veridici Augustini allegationibus fidem adhibere delegisti.' p. 1294.

to comprehend the bearings of the question. An able investigator of the course of the whole controversy has observed that even in the language of the Council of Chiersy there 'is nothing to which the most rigid predestinarian might not subscribe.'[1]

Sequel of the controversy in the ninth century.

The sequel of these polemics, which shews us the decision of the Council of Chiersy reversed in 855, at the Council of Valence, when the *ineptiae quaestiunculae*, and the *pultes Scotorum*[2] of John and his supporters were condemned as inimical to the faith—a censure confirmed by the verbal adoption of these decrees at the Council of Langres in 859[3]—proves that Hincmar had scarcely exercised a sound discretion in his choice of a champion.[4] Mere learning and skill in argument could not atone for the evident laxity of doctrine of the brilliant Irishman. The boldness with which he rejected authority unless that authority appeared to him supported by reason—his denial of the personality of the principle of evil, and of the eternity of future punishment—his frequent appeals to those philosophers whom the Church had expressly discarded—all marked him out as a teacher little in unison with the doctrines and principles of the Latin Church.

Value of its literature as illustrative of the progress towards scholasticism.

For our special purpose, however, the foregoing details of the controversy between John and his antagonists have the highest value. They belong to what was really the turning point in the history of mediaeval education and learning. They exhibit, side by side with the too mechanical and unintelligent traditions handed down by Bede and Alcuin, another element—the spirit of enquiry, reason, and discussion. For the advance thus made we are probably indebted quite as much to Rabanus as to John Scotus—the former opened the gates through which the latter fought a passage, to fall, if we may pursue the metaphor, undiscoverable among the slain. Mystery, indeed, gathers round the whole career

[1] Mozley, *Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination*, p. 411.

[2] Cossart, xv 3–6.

[3] Ibid. xv 537–8.

[4] Ampère justly characterises John, in his relation to Hincmar, as 'un allié fort habile, mais assez dangereux, et dont le secours l'avait compromis,' iii 87.

CHAP. V.

Doubts respecting John's latter career.

of this very remarkable man. While some hold that he is to be traced returning to England a fugitive from the Frankish court, *propter infamiam*, and finally meeting at Malmesbury with a sudden and tragical end, others, it would seem with greater probability, are disposed to conclude that his career closed in Frankland,[1] and that, long after the controversy with Gotteschalk was over, he continued to adorn the Palace School, protected and esteemed by his royal patron so long as that patron lived.

Quid distat inter—?

Of the relations between the two a story is told by William of Malmesbury, which, containing as it does the best *bon mot* of the Middle Ages, and admirably illustrating the peculiar bent of the intellectual activity of the time, we may venture to tell once more. In John's mode of approaching a question, the scholastic method is, for the first time, clearly to be recognised—a method of which it may be said that the endeavour to distinguish and define was at once its weakness and its strength. Clearly perceiving, and few have ever seen so well, how much all human knowledge depends on classification, the schoolmen were untiring in their efforts to elaborate distinctions, and to refer every imaginable object to its class. Their first enquiries consequently nearly always assumed this form—*Quid est inter* or *quid distat inter*, this thing and that? Tell me the *differentia* of each, and I shall begin to understand its real nature, its distinctive attributes. We may be perfectly sure that in his intercourse with so enquiring an intellect as that of Charles the Bald, and in his numerous controversies in Frankland, John Scotus had heard the enquiry, *Quid distat inter*—? until even he was well-nigh weary of the sound. But there were hours of respite, and at the royal board monarch and philosopher alike would seek rather for amusement than instruction. It was one day they thus sat—John opposite the king. The meal was ended, and

[1] Huber, pp. 108–115, sums up very clearly the evidence for Erigena's later history. He points out (p. 121) that there is a good reason for believing that John was in frequent communication with Charles close upon the time of the latter's death in 877. Christlieb concurs in this view, and thinks it probable that John continued to reside at the Frankish court even after that event, p. 25.

the winecup was circling, when John, less mindful perhaps than usual of the necessary decorum, under the influence of some generous vintage, appears to have transgressed by some trivial act against the Frankish etiquette.[1] Charles, who was in a jocose vein, imagined he now had the keen-witted Celt at his mercy. *Quid distat*, he asked, *inter sottum*[2] *et Scottum*? 'Nought, may it please your majesty,' replied John, 'save this table.'

The connexion between this era and that of the University of Paris.

Quid distat and the spirit it typified survived not only the monarch and the philosopher, but also the Carolingian dynasty. The invasions of the Northmen, irreparable as were the losses they inflicted on learning, were attended by less fatal results in the land of the Frank than in our own country. The traditions which, after the time of Alfred the Great, are no longer to be discerned in England, may plainly be traced in France. The influence of John Scotus, indeed, is of that vaguer and more general kind which is felt rather than seen, but from Rabanus we can perceive the handing down of an unmistakeable and unbroken tradition. In Eric of Auxerre, the pupil of both Rabanus and Lupus Servatus, the panegyrist of Charles the Bald and the tutor of his son Lothair, the teaching of Fulda found an able supporter. Auxerre became a chief centre of learning, and among Eric's pupils was Remy of Auxerre, who taught both at Rheims and at Paris. At Rheims, Remy numbered among his followers Hildebald and Blidulfus, the eminent founders of the schools in Lotharingia, and Sigulfus and Frodoard, who carried on the school at Rheims, and prepared the way for Gerbert. At Paris he had for his pupil the saintly and austere Odo of Cluny, a monk from St. Martin of Tours. At Cluny, Odo became in turn a teacher, and revived, with

[1] 'Carolus fronte hilarior post quaedam alia, cum vidisset Johannem quiddam fecisse quod Gallicanum comitatem offenderet, &c.'—William of Malmesbury, *De Pontif.* Lib. v; Gale, *Scriptores*, i 360.

[2] SOTTUS, stolidus, bardus, Gallis *sot*.' Ducange, s. v. Charles, perhaps, is hardly entitled to the credit of this witticism, for Theodulfus had written forty years before,

'Hic Scottus, sottus, cottus trinomen habebit.' Migne, cv 325.

CHAP. V.

eminent success, the observance of the Benedictine rule and the cultivation of letters. Under his teaching were trained a numerous band: Aymer, Baldwin, Gottfried, Landric, Wulfad, Adhegrin, Hildebald, Eliziard, and John, Odo's admiring biographer. These were the men who, in conjunction with the pupils of Gerbert, sustained the work of education in the tenth century, while Hucbald of Liège, proceeding from St. Gall, instructed the canons of Ste. Geneviève at Paris, and taught in the cathedral school. In the eleventh century the pupils of Abbo of Fleury, among whom were Haymo the historian, Bernard, Herveus, Odalric, Girard, and Thierry, were the most eminent scholars of their day; while Drogo taught with eminent success at Paris where the Capetian dynasty had permanently taken up its residence. The neighbouring schools, Chartres, Tours, and Le Bec, were attracted to a common centre: numbers multiplied and the ardour for learning visibly increased. Among Drogo's pupils was John the Deaf, and John, in turn, was the teacher of Roscellinus. Roscellinus, trained also in the famous school at Chartres, had for his pupils, Peter of Cluny, Odo of Cambrai, and William of Champeaux; and when, in the year 1109, William of Champeaux opened his school for the study of logic in Paris, the university era had already begun.

Conclusion.

But even when regarded apart from that all-important commencement, and merely as an isolated episode in the history of European culture, the revival that has occupied our attention is deserving of careful study. It exhibits, as it were in miniature, the working of those threefold tendencies, to one or other of which well-nigh all the chief moments in the progress of modern thought may be referred:—the traditions, handed down from republican and imperial Rome, of law and order, of reverence for authority and the established order of things—the more independent and vigorous intellectual characteristics of Teutonism, submitting, but in no slavish fashion, to such of those traditions as, after candid scrutiny and lengthened trial, it finds itself increasingly unwilling to reject—the

inquiring, restless, and often unruly Celtic spirit, touched and quickened by Hellenic thought, delighting in the discovery of new paths, impatient of every unproven formula, and accepting half-mistrustfully, at best, even what comes to it stamped with the highest sanction of wisdom and experience.

And when, after looking back over the thousand years that have elapsed since the reign of Charles the Bald, the student turns from the ninth to the nineteenth century, and recognises these self-same tendencies in more extended operation around him at the present day, and at the same time recalls the advance that Christian Europe has made—the purer faith, the fuller knowledge, the happier lot vouchsafed to us—he cannot but gather something of hope and confidence for the future. He may even venture to look upon these diverse manifestations of the human intellect as each an element of good, a divinely appointed factor in human progress to aid us in attaining to a yet nobler and more perfect existence.

LONDON: PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
AND PARLIAMENT STREET
ANASTATISCHER-DRUCK v. C.PARIS. BERLIN, N. 58.

Date Due

12/30/51			
11-20			

Library Bureau Cat. no. 1137

WITHDRAWN